

down American policies and to involve United States in purely European affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of Quinsigamond Val Lodge, No. 1, International Order of Good Templars, in respect of enforcement of eighteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES: Petition of Gottfried Tinzmann, Chicago, Ill., containing protest against ratification of the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Social and Mutual Advancement Association of the Blind, urging the Congress and the President to make liberal appropriations for the American Printing House for the Blind; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Cincinnati Milling Machine Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, by Dr. Otto P. Geier, secretary, urging appropriation of \$1,500,000 for investigation of causes of influenza; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Mr. H. S. Jeffery, chairman advisory board Philadelphia and Camden Federations of Pennsylvania Systems Lines, Philadelphia, Pa., urging Congress to pass the Plum plan of ownership and operation of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of L. W. Meckstroth, president Woodstock Typewriter Co., Chicago, Ill., and Mechanics Machine Co., Rockford, Ill., containing protests against House joint resolution 121 concerning conference regarding relations between capital and labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of H. C. Thom, W. C. Graham, and R. A. Stearns, all of Chicago, Ill., containing protests against the Kendrick bill (S. 2199) and the Kenyon bill (S. 2202) concerning the packing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Pickle Packers' Association, Mr. F. A. Vickers, secretary, Chicago, Ill., urging retention of zone advances on advertising pages in periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the committee on legislation and facts of the Motion Picture Exhibitors of America (Inc.), by Louis F. Blumenthal, chairman, urging repeal of the admission of film rental and increased seat taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, July 22, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before Thee this morning ever dependent upon Thy guidance and Thy blessing. In the midst of the world's confusion, in the midst of the blood that runs high, in the midst of antagonisms of race and of peoples, we come to Thee. Thou art the God of order and of law. We pray that as Thou hast called us to this high and holy office we may follow the Divine commandments and work out the plans for the protection of the world in the interest of peace, and establish above all things a reign of righteousness among men. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5726. An act to fix the compensation of certain employees of the United States;

H. R. 6810. An act to prohibit intoxicating beverages, and to regulate the manufacture, production, use, and sale of high-proof spirits for other than beverage purposes, and to insure an ample supply of alcohol and promote its use in scientific research and in the development of fuel, dye, and other lawful industries; and

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution to ratify and confirm from and including July 1, 1919, obligations incurred pursuant to the terms of certain appropriations for the fiscal year 1920.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair presents a petition from the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, which will be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

The petition is as follows:

EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Honolulu, Hawaii, July 7, 1919.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

Sir: I have the honor to transmit herewith, at the request of the Tenth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, senate concurrent resolution No. 32.

Very truly, yours,

C. J. MCCARTHY,
Governor of Hawaii.

Concurrent resolution.

Whereas a substantial increase in the compensation of the officers and employees of the Territory of Hawaii and its political subdivisions is warranted by the high cost of living which now exists and which will probably become much higher in the immediate future on account of the tremendous demand for foodstuffs, materials, and supplies of all descriptions; and

Whereas the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii for the year 1919, fully appreciating the seriousness of the situation, has, by proper legislation, substantially increased the compensation of practically all such officers and employees; and

Whereas there are certain officers, namely, the members of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, and the governor, whose compensation can only be fixed by the Congress of the United States, and who are entitled to have such compensation increased: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested to enact such legislation as shall increase the compensation of the members of the legislature from the sum of \$600 to the sum of \$1,000 for each regular session thereof, and as shall increase the compensation from the sum of \$200 to the sum of \$500 for each special session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, and as shall increase the compensation of the governor of Hawaii from the sum of \$7,000 per annum to the sum of \$10,000 per annum: Be it further

Resolved, That the governor of the Territory of Hawaii be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, and to the Delegate from Hawaii.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 29, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on April 29, A. D. 1919.

CHAS. F. CHILLINGWORTH,
President of the Senate.

O. P. SOARES,
Clerk of the Senate.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE
TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 30, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on April 30, A. D. 1919.

H. L. HOLSTEIN,
Speaker House of Representatives.

EDWARD WOODWARD,
Clerk House of Representatives.

Mr. CURTIS. I present a couple of telegrams protesting against the schedule of discounts issued by the Grain Corporation. I ask that they be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BELLEVILLE, KANS., July 21, 1919.

Senator CHARLES CURTIS, Washington, D. C.:

Schedule of discounts issued by United States Grain Corporation is a hardship on wheat growers of Kansas. We pray that you will give this matter your consideration and that you will make recommendations that may result in a revision of these exorbitant discounts and assist the growers of Kansas in securing a reasonable price for their low-grade wheat.

R. B. WARD
(And 100 others).

HUTCHINSON, KANS.

Senator CHARLES CURTIS, Washington, D. C.:

Farmers of Reno County in mass convention assembled protest vigorously against action of Grain Corporation on cumulative and excessive discounts on lower grades of wheat; also against action of Grain Corporation in refusing licenses to competitive exporters. Grain Corporation's yield of Reno County wheat will not average over 10 bushels per acre and will not test over No. 3.

SHERIDAN PLOUGHE,
JOHN ROWLAND,
J. W. HAMILTON,
T. F. SMYTHE,
PETER DECK,
JOSEPH McGUIRE,
Committee.

R. A. ELWARD,
President.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I present a resolution of the El Paso Chamber of Commerce indorsing the National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico, which I ask to have printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution indorsing National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico.

Whereas for a period of eight years there has been nothing but chaos in the Republic of Mexico, nothing but an elemental civilization; during most of this period the only light that shone in the darkness was that which flashed from the cannon's mouth in the incendiary blaze of revolution and unrestricted banditry, which has had so disastrous an effect upon the lives and property of foreigners in that country, especially Americans; and

Whereas the people of Mexico themselves have been the chief sufferers from the chaotic conditions which have seriously menaced the moral and economic fabric of the entire Republic and caused untold loss of life and property; and

Whereas Americans and other foreigners have, in good faith, invested hundreds of millions in Mexico in the development of her resources, thereby adding to that nation's assets what would otherwise have remained a liability, and through the individual enterprise of Americans within her borders her financial, industrial, and commercial institutions have been established on a sound basis of credits and trade relations and employment afforded for thousands of her people; and

Whereas the future economic and commercial development is largely dependent upon American capital and enterprise, neither of which will be available unless the Mexican laws provide for, and the Mexican officials recognize, the rights of American citizens and actually afford adequate protection to their lives and property as well as other foreigners; and

Whereas certain sections of Mexico are infested with outlaws, revolutionists, and bandits, who spasmodically blow up trains and trackage, rob railroad cars, burn bridges, and convert themselves into "consignees" of any foreign merchandise obtainable, and thereby paralyzing commercial intercourse, which is the life blood of national existence; and

Whereas the Federal Government of Mexico being unable to maintain vigilance and guarantee any degree of safety to shipments of merchandise of any character in these sections, comprising some of the richest territory of the North American Continent; and

Whereas the Federal Government of Mexico being unable to afford protection to the industrial and commercial institutions owned and operated by Americans, thereby failing to perform the functions for which such a government ordinarily exists; and

Whereas through its President the Federal Government of Mexico has fostered, promoted, and caused to be enacted such anti-American legislation as contained in article 27 of Mexico's new constitution, which provides among other policies, radical in the extreme and as it is retroactive is confiscatory of the property rights of Americans, "among other things providing that—

"(a) No foreign corporation or individual can legally acquire or hold any mines, oil wells, land, or other real property in Mexico unless he renounces his citizenship.

"(b) The ownership to all minerals, solid, liquid, or gaseous is declared to be vested in the nation, regardless of existing rights based upon the old constitution"; and

Whereas the full textual contents of this constitution is significant of the Federal Government's anti-American policy being given expression through its President on many occasions; and

Whereas we know as a matter of fact that throughout all this period Americans have suffered gross injustices in Mexico, and no means have been tendered by the Federal Government of Mexico to prevent or suppress to any positive extent these crimes against our people, although some individual officials have done all that they could consistently do under authority of their President to offer means of protection; and

Whereas the American people of this great border district, extending 2,000 miles in length, have for the past eight years been forced to witness crimes against American citizens on the American side of the border, committed by Mexicans of all factions, and they are now seeking some means whereby this maelstrom of elements may be cleared, not only for the sake of our own people, but as much for the masses of Mexico who are bleeding from this unabated revolutionary and banditry reign, in order that they might throw away their armor and take the plow and open the furrows and plant the seed; and

Whereas the United States Government is spending over a million dollars a week to maintain an army on the Mexican border, intended for the purpose of protecting lives and property of Americans from raids by bandits, the necessity and wisdom of which is not questioned; and

Whereas bad faith has been shown in many ways by the Federal Government of Mexico in matters pertaining to rights of American citizens, and our people having failed to coordinate their efforts to prevent repetition of these same acts against the rights of Americans along the border and in Mexico; and

Whereas the inaccurate reports of conditions in Mexico have served to do injustice to the people of Mexico, who are working fearlessly for the readjustment of their country's affairs, and there are many of these people in Mexico; and

Whereas the ill-informed people of the United States have given expression to affairs of Mexico of which they know not, and have thereby caused undue agitation; and

Whereas it is now possible, through the National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico, to organize and assemble data in the form of sworn affidavits affecting foreign industries and enterprises in Mexico, and to investigate all decrees, laws, and regulations and other general developments affecting American rights in Mexico; and

Whereas through this medium the individual American citizen, as well as the large companies with holdings and interests in Mexico, may expect to obtain relief from the present conditions by becoming affiliated with this national association; and

Whereas this association proposes to and is actually combining the mass efforts and intelligent force of the American people for the purpose of bringing a concerted action to bear upon our Government in pressing the importance of this problem and the necessity for its solution in a manner accruing honor unto ourselves and affording the relief for which every intelligent, unselfish, and patriotic citizen of Mexico is hoping for; and

Whereas this condition of stability and responsibility can only be accomplished by an unselfish desire to assist the people of Mexico to recognize their obligations toward American citizens; and

Whereas our Government in the past has rendered unselfish service to small nations of people, torn by oppression and revolution; and

Whereas it is plain enough how our rights as a free people and our honor as a sovereign Government and other Governments have been

violated, notwithstanding the numerous pledges made that foreign rights in Mexico would be protected; and

Whereas a body of the most representative citizens of this country have instituted a plan to educate the general public of America as to the true conditions in Mexico, and is now combining the economic and moral forces of patriotism for the realization of this purpose: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the El Paso Chamber of Commerce, representing over a thousand of the leading men in El Paso, through its board of directors, in meeting assembled, declares its approval of the principle, and does unqualifiedly indorse the program of the National Association for Protection of American Rights in Mexico; and be it further

Resolved, That without bitterness or hate toward the Mexican people, but with an unselfish desire to assist them to end the reign of terror that is undermining her national life, we urge upon our Government the necessity of some definite corrective action; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of our Representatives and Senators in Washington, our State senators, the governor of Texas, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Texas Chamber of Commerce, and the various chambers of commerce through Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico, and that a copy of this resolution be placed upon the official records of the organizations named, requesting these organizations to pass resolutions of a similar nature.

CHARLES N. BASSETT, *President*.
W. S. CROMBIE, *First Vice President*.
GEO. B. RYAN, *Second Vice President*.
E. W. KATSEB, *Treasurer*.
O. J. BINFORD, *Director*.
H. E. CHRISTIE, *Director*.
G. A. MARTIN, *Director*.
A. SCHWARTZ, *Director*.
M. A. WARNER, *Director*.
JOS. A. WRIGHT, *Director*.

I hereby certify the above to be a true and correct copy of resolution as passed on the 2d day of July, 1919, by the board of directors of the El Paso Chamber of Commerce.

EARL M. ROBERTS, *General Manager*.

Mr. FLETCHER. I present resolutions of the American Federation of Labor, which I desire to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., July 18, 1919.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
Committee on Commerce,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I beg leave to call to your attention the following preambles and resolutions, which were considered and adopted at the recent session of the American Federation of Labor in Atlantic City, June 9-23, relating to an act approved March 4, 1915, known as the seamen's act:

"Whereas the purpose of the seamen's act, as stated by its promoters, was to equalize the wage cost of operating American and foreign vessels and to bring the American to sea; and

"Whereas the wages of foreign vessels leaving ports of the United States have since August 1, 1916, when the act became effective, followed the wages paid on American vessels from the same ports, like a cart following a horse to which it is hitched; and

"Whereas the wages paid in English ports is the same as paid in the port of New York, and the wages paid at Scandinavian ports in the overseas trade is within \$3 of wages paid at the port of New York; and

"Whereas the wage paid from Italy has already risen to within \$10 of that paid seamen in American ports; and

"Whereas the number of native Americans employed on American vessels sailing from the Pacific coast ports has risen from zero to about 24 per cent of the whole crew, and on the Atlantic coast from less than 10 per cent to about 30 per cent, since the seamen's act became operative: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we denounce the bills introduced by Senator CALDER and Congressman GOULD to repeal the important clauses of the seamen's act as hostile to the national interests of the United States, as hostile to the development of American sea power, and as serving the interests of European and Asiatic shipowners, who under this act are gradually being compelled to meet the American shipowner in a fair competition on the high seas; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be submitted to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, to the Shipping Board, the Department of Commerce, and, if necessary, to the President of the United States."

Your committee recommends the adoption of the resolution. The report of the committee was adopted.

On behalf of the American Federation of Labor I urge you to oppose this bill, H. R. 491, and all other measures having for their purpose nullification of provisions of the seamen's act.

Respectfully, yours,

FRANK MORRISON,
Secretary American Federation of Labor.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Pensacola, Fla., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Harrison bill relating to naval stores, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WARREN presented a memorial of Slovenic National Benefit Society No. 267, of Sublet, Wyo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation prohibiting the admission to the mails of any matter printed in a foreign language, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WILLIAMS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Yazoo City, Miss., remonstrating against the proposed plan of the Secretary of the Interior to reclaim arid and swamp lands, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

RELIEF AND PROMOTION OF CERTAIN ARMY OFFICERS.

Mr. NEW, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2448) for the relief of certain officers of the United States Army, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 98) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 2575) for the relief of Furness, Withy & Co. (Ltd.); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 2576) to require street railways carrying passengers in their cars within the District of Columbia to provide equal but separate accommodations for the white and colored races, and to prescribe punishments and penalties for violating its provisions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 2577) granting a pension to Adelia Sullivan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 2578) granting a pension to Rufus E. Bean (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 2579) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Schamp; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 2580) granting an increase of pension to Esli A. Bowen (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 2581) to fix the compensation of certain employees of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 2582) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the acts of August 4, 1914, August 15, 1914, March 3, 1915, September 7, 1916, and June 21, 1917; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 2583) granting an increase of pension to William A. Karnes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2584) to regulate pawnbrokers and their business in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ELKINS:

A bill (S. 2585) granting an increase of pension to William K. Brown;

A bill (S. 2586) granting a pension to John W. Gilpin;

A bill (S. 2587) granting an increase of pension to George W. Swiger;

A bill (S. 2588) granting an increase of pension to John P. Fetty; and

A bill (S. 2589) granting a pension to Annie Gilmore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 2590) to incorporate a foreign finance corporation to provide means of acquiring and selling public and private foreign securities, extending credits against the same and assisting in the development of the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 2591) authorizing the sale of inherited and unpartitioned allotments for townsite purposes in the Quapaw Agency, Okla.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (by request):

A bill (S. 2592) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, consider, and determine the claims of certain Choctaw Indians not heretofore finally enrolled to whom privileges were guaranteed under the treaty of 1830; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HARDING:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 74) for the relief of the relatives of the officers and enlisted men of the Naval collier *Cyclops*; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LODGE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 75) authorizing the appointment of an ambassador to Belgium; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUSAN F. BURDINE.

Mr. CALDER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 130) which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate to Susan F. Burdine, widow of William T. Burdine, late a private of the Capitol police force, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PEACE TREATY AND LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I give notice that following the address of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] on Thursday I wish to submit some remarks on the treaty of peace particularly with reference to the league of nations.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, much of the correspondence with me regarding the proposed league of nations is based upon the assumption that the adoption of the league will establish permanent peace in the world. On Tuesday the 29th after the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY] I give notice that I shall address the Senate upon that phase of the subject.

ADDRESS OF DR. SOUTHARD (S. DOC. NO. 56).

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I have here an address on the prevention, control, and cure of tuberculosis by Dr. Southard, of Fort Smith, Ark. It is a particularly able and valuable paper and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not catch the title of the address which the Senator from Arkansas desires printed as a document.

Mr. OWEN. It is on the prevention and cure of tuberculosis, and has been prepared by Dr. Southard, of Fort Smith, Ark. It is very short and, I think, is of value.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAPPER in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONFIRMATION OF THOMAS H. TULLEY.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, at the last executive session of the Senate the nomination of Thomas H. Tulley for collector of customs at Denver, Colo., was confirmed. The President was not notified of the confirmation because of the absence of my colleague [Mr. PHIPPS], who consents to his confirmation as in executive session. Therefore, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the President may be notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the President will be notified of the confirmation of Thomas H. Tulley.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

H. R. 5726. An act to fix the compensation of certain employees of the United States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 6810. An act to prohibit intoxicating beverages, and to regulate the manufacture, production, use, and sale of high-proof spirits for other than beverage purposes, and to insure an ample supply of alcohol and promote its use in scientific research, and in the development of fuel, dye, and other lawful industries, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution to ratify and confirm from and including July 1, 1919, obligations incurred pursuant to the terms of certain appropriations for the fiscal year 1920 was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. McNARY obtained the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will yield to me, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gore	McCumber	Robinson
Bankhead	Gronna	McKellar	Sheppard
Beckham	Hale	McLean	Sherman
Calder	Harding	McNary	Simmons
Capper	Harris	Moses	Smith, Md.
Culberson	Harrison	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Cummins	Henderson	Nelson	Smoot
Curtis	Hitchcock	New	Stanley
Dial	Johnson, Calif.	Newberry	Sutherland
Dillingham	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Swanson
Edge	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Thomas
Elkins	Kellogg	Overman	Trammell
Fall	Kenyon	Owen	Underwood
Fernald	Keyes	Page	Warren
Fletcher	King	Phelan	Watson
France	Kirby	Phipps	Williams
Gay	Knox	Poin Dexter	Wolcott
Gerry	Lodge	Pomerene	

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] is detained from the Senate by illness.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], and the Senator

from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Oregon will proceed.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, conformable to the practice of the Senate, I announced on Friday of last week that, following the morning business, on this day I would discuss the league of nations. I trust I shall not be asked to yield while I occupy the floor, as I would not like to have the continuity of my speech broken; but at its conclusion, if I am able, I shall be happy to answer any questions asked me.

Mr. President, I have repressed whatever desire I may have had to discuss the treaty of peace until through conventional channels this important document reached the Senate Chamber.

At this time I shall address myself to that all-absorbing portion of the terms of peace dealing with the character and defining the functions of the league of nations. I indulge the hope that I approach a discussion of this important subject free from partisan bias. The issue created by the movement to combine nations to insure peace rises far above political platforms or party expediency. The subject, therefore, should receive that calm and just consideration made possible only when partisanship is adjourned. The quicker we forget our party affiliations the sooner will we be able to reach the proper solution of this tremendous problem.

Mr. President, I am stoutly in favor of the principle embodied in any effort to insure the permanent peace of the world, and I am willing to accept the covenant of the league of nations contained in the peace treaty. The time is back of us for a discussion of this subject in general statements of the sublimity of peace, or indulging with owlish wisdom the ominous predictions of a disgraced and destroyed Republic. The people of America desire to know what the covenant contains of substance, and will go there to obtain their understanding.

I think it may be assumed that, aside from those who are opposed to this Nation becoming a member of any organization calculated to make wars more difficult of birth, the objectionable provisions are but few in number, though substantial and grievous to those who oppose the present covenant or who desire to effect material amendments.

Of the objections of this character I take it that article 10 is the most obnoxious and productive of the most controversy. The statement most generally made is that this article collides with our Constitution and runs across the path of our sacred traditions. This statement may well be challenged. Repeatedly the argument has been advanced that article 10 casts upon this Government an absolute obligation to go to war under any conditions, however bereft of justice. This indictment, in my opinion, is untenable.

Properly to analyze this provision of the covenant a distinction must be made between the first and second parts of the article defining our obligation in the event of the happening of the contingency for which it proposes to prescribe a rule of national conduct. For obvious reasons I shall consider the divisions of the subject in order of inversion.

In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat, or danger of such aggression, the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

In this sentence no obligation, moral or legal, presses upon any country to adopt the method to repel aggression advised by the council. The adoption of the means is left to the election of the various nations, though in all human probability, if a situation would arise whereby concert of action was sought, the advice of the council as to the means would be followed if believed to be practicable and just. By the force of another article in the covenant the council, in arriving at a decision, will be governed by unanimous vote, the power of veto standing between this country and an unwise remedy. That part of the article about which the controversy wages is as follows:

The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve, as against external aggression, the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league.

Indisputably this provision casts upon this country and every other nation a member of the league a joint and several undertaking to go to war to protect an associate of the league from invasion through external force, but this obligation is in no proper sense a legal one, but purely a moral obligation, entirely dependent upon the condition that the cause of the war and the war itself is violative of the moral conscience of the American people.

Having stated my premises, I shall proceed briefly to assign the reasons for my deductions:

He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur. (Art. II, sec. 2.)

This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land. (Art. VI.)

Thus it will appear that the architects of the Constitution were very generous in the quantity and the power conferred upon the Executive and the Senate in the matter of treaty making. However, the power is not unlimited, though conferred in general terms. Without doubt the two branches of the Government which have to do with the treaty making are not hedged about with restrictions like the law-making power which the Constitution carefully specifies may deal with certain enumerated subjects. The text writers, discussing this subject and the decisions of the Supreme Court, declare that whatever the Constitution positively forbids may not be done by a treaty any more than by any different means. In the case of *Geofrey v. Riggs* (133 U. S., p. 267), the Supreme Court, speaking through Chief Justice Field, said:

The treaty power, as expressed in the Constitution, is in terms unlimited except by those restraints which are found in that instrument against the action of the Government or of its departments, and those arising from the nature of the Government itself and of that of the States. It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government, or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent.

When the court said that by treaty nothing could be done which is forbidden by the Constitution it gave implied expression to the rule that which the Constitution directs shall be done in a particular way may not be done through the medium of a treaty in a manner other than the one prescribed in the Constitution. The treaty-making power can not legally usurp any prerogative of the legislative branch of the Government conferred by the fundamental law, consequently when the supreme law of the land provides how and by what agency war shall be declared, that agency then works in an exclusive field and its right to function in this particular field can not be abrogated, lessened, or enlarged by the treaty-making power.

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, * * * to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States, * * * to declare war, * * * to raise and support armies, * * * to provide and maintain a Navy, and make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. (Art. I, sec. 8.)

In no sense, therefore, can the executive branch of the Government, aided by the Senate, cast any legal obligation upon this or any future Congress to pass a declaration of war upon any nation, however unjustly offending. The wisdom of our forefathers was never employed to better advantage than when this limitation by intentment was placed upon the power vested with the treaty-making body.

Viewing this subject as I do, it is not consistent with reason to argue that article 10 of the covenant lays a legal duty upon some future Congress to declare war against any nation that attempts by the use of force the invasion of the territory of a member of the league, nor the more unpleasant duty of requiring the Government to send our splendid soldiers to some foreign land to suppress "external aggression" defined in the covenant.

Over and above that, it must not be said that this interpretation would mislead any other member of the league of nations to its injury or operate to our dishonor, for the very solid reason that international law recognizes the constitutional limitations under which a nation makes its treaty. It is legally obligatory upon the signatories to the covenant of the league to observe and to respect these limitations. They must consider and be guided by the limit of power placed in the hands of the treaty-making agency. In close analogy is this doctrine to the one in the law of agency, that a principal is liable only for the acts of an agent within the real or apparent scope of his authority, and a person dealing with that instrumentality must inform himself of the extent of the power conferred. Nations can not be heard to say that they relied upon the provision of a treaty when that provision is outside of the treaty-making sphere.

In my opinion, the extent and nature of the obligation imposed by article 10 is not involved by any doubt as to its proper solution. This Nation is under a moral bond to fulfill its obligations and go to war, if need be, whensoever the fulfillment of the obligations is justified by the rules of morals.

If I have in part developed the thought that the article places upon the American people a moral duty to assist an associate nation to repel external aggression only when the doing of the act of assistance comes within the rule of proper

moral conduct, then much of the force of the argument used against the article is destroyed. While no one can predict with any considerable accuracy what the future course of Congress would be in the event that one nation would wantonly strike at another nation by forcible invasion, yet without a league it may be said in safety that in order to repel the assault the sentiment of this country would supply the momentum to persuade Congress to declare war, that the peace of the earth might be maintained. We would not stand by supinely and again see the world drenched by human blood, in the absence of the moral obligation assumed, nor does the assumption that the undertaking imposes a duty prevent this Nation from being the sole judge in deciding whether the contingency comes within the scope of our moral pledge.

As a Nation we have never faltered in the practice of virtue in endeavoring to secure peace by conflict, and I make bold to hazard a prediction that if the world was again menaced by a cruel, relentless foe the conscience of the American people would be so aroused as to exert its supreme power through constitutional channels to extinguish the madness by a declaration of war, enforced by our soldiery and armaments.

This moral force in the obligation imposed upon the nations of the world, in my opinion, will do much to chill the ambitious designs of nations that heretofore have been the cause of cruel wars, and for that reason I shall oppose by my vote any eradication of article 10 from the covenant. It is the pillar section of the association of nations contemplated under the league, and is the assurance of mutual support against any external aggression. It speaks the voice of freedom among the nations and guarantees to each its full share of sovereignty. It makes possible and encourages the reduction of armaments, as no nation will disarm unless assured that it will not be attacked by another nation. Nations which disarm or progressively deprive themselves of the weapons to repel an assault must protect themselves either by erecting a super-state, with an international armed force to guard them, or by entering into a compact to come to each other's aid when an outlaw nation threatens the use of force. This principle has been recognized by students of history from the time thought was first given to plans for the promotion of world peace. The late ex-President Theodore Roosevelt, discussing the prevention of war through arbitration treaties, in an address at Christiania, Norway, May 5, 1910, said:

I believe that these treaties can cover almost all questions liable to arise between such nations, if they are drawn with the explicit agreement that each contracting party will respect the other's territory and its absolute sovereignty within that territory and the equally explicit agreement that (aside from very rare cases where the nation's honor is vitally concerned) all other possible subjects of controversy will be submitted to arbitration.

In a world league accompanied by an agreement for reduction of armament the necessity of a covenant containing the moral virility of article 10 is manifest.

Mr. President, a close dissection of the covenant justifies the statement that, in addition to supplying a great moral force augmented by actual force, if agreeable to the moral conscience of this Nation, article 10 defines a principle of conduct among the nations of the world that will be carried into execution by the other provisions of the covenant. It calls for no action until all other checks and remedies have failed to pacify a quarrelsome nation or in the event of extraordinary emergency, such as a sudden and unprovoked assault by an outlaw country.

It is not my purpose to open the covenant and analyze each article; that has been done by others. I only desire to observe that in articles 11 to 17, inclusive, provisions are made for the peaceful settlement of disputes through arbitration, by mediation, by the strength of universal boycott and economic pressure, and by covenants restraining war for a period of time.

Article 10 is devoid of any substance justifying members of the league to summon their strength to prevent any nation from making a change in its form of government, nor does it, nor the force it commands, prevent a nation from separating into distinct political units through the process of revolution. The article has nothing to do with internal uprisings that find their source in the genial soil from which springs the desire for self-determination.

Doubt has risen with regard to the understanding of certain contents of the covenant. From the opponents of the league comes a demand for amendments and reservations without proper regard for the results that will flow from such a course. An amendment would mean such a substantial change in some article of the covenant as to require the concurrence of the signatory nations thereto, and probably lead to delay and much controversy and possible rejection. Without doubt, by acquiescence, followed by an acceptance of some benefit under the treaty by a nation, the covenant would be limited by the

amendments, so far as this country is concerned. An amendment is a change in substance, and requires ratification by all the other nations. In the discussion of this matter the term "reservation" is used to perform the same office as an amendment. We are not interested in the expression employed to perform the operation, but instead the thing that is done. This treaty, carrying the luggage of amendments or reservations, must of necessity go back to the original signatories and be accepted by them before it would be a binding contract.

Justice Brown, speaking for the Supreme Court in the *Diamond Rings v. The United States* (183 U. S., 167), says:

Obviously the treaty must contain the whole contract between the parties, and the power of the Senate is limited to a ratification of such terms as have already been agreed upon between the President, acting for the United States, and the commissioners of the other contracting power. The Senate has no right to ratify the treaty and introduce new terms into it which shall be obligatory upon the other power, although it may refuse its ratification or make such ratification conditional upon the adoption of amendments to the treaty.

However, the Senate could without postponing the day of the ratification of the treaty or requiring its resubmission to the other nations by a resolution place its interpretation as to the meaning of articles in the league susceptible to one or more meanings. For example, article 21, which reads:

Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace.

By many it is argued with much display of learning that the Monroe doctrine is in no sense a "regional understanding," and therefore it is not fully protected. Many others who have studied the covenant hold that this traditional policy is fully protected. Consequently without altering the terms of peace and with evident propriety the Senate could attach to the treaty a resolution stating its understanding of the article by again defining and declaring the doctrine of Monroe. Resolutions of this kind which in their purpose are not supposed to amend or alter, but only to interpret, the treaty do not operate to effect a change in the terms as to require ratification by other nations. If we should go further in this regard and attempt by an explanatory expression, whatever it may be called in name, to introduce a substantial change in an article, it would be in effect an amendment and would require resubmission to the other signatories.

To strike from the covenant article 10 would clearly be an amendment, such as to require ratification by the other parties to the treaty. To limit, alter, or modify the moral obligation would, in my opinion, operate as an amendment. We must not forget that if we attempt by general reservations or amendments to alter the splendid purposes of the covenant or weaken it so far as it affects our duties, it can not be expected that other nations will not follow our lead. Having demonstrated our altruism and unselfishness in this war and our overpowering strength and sublime heroism, is it not rather beneath our ideals to ask special privileges when the peace of the world and the welfare and happiness of mankind is involved?

That part of the covenant which refers to the exemption of domestic matters from consideration by the league says:

If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them and is found by the council to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the council shall so report and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement. (Art. 15.)

Upon reading this provision of the covenant those opposed argue that the language does not place important matters of domestic concern, like immigration and tariff, out of the jurisdiction of the council or of the assembly. They propose reservations exempting the consideration of these matters from the league. This action I think unnecessary, for the reason that the highest tribunal in our land has decided that by the rules of international law subjects of this kind are absolutely and exclusively within the jurisdiction of this country, inherent as a right of sovereignty and therefore impossible of alienation by treaty.

Mr. Justice Gerry, speaking for the Supreme Court in the case of *Nishimura Ekin v. The United States* (142 U. S., 651), said:

It is an accepted maxim of international law that every sovereign nation has the power as inherent in sovereignty and essential to self-preservation to forbid the entrance of foreigners within its dominions or to admit them only in such cases and upon such conditions as it may see fit to prescribe.

In the *Chinese Exclusion* case (130 U. S., 581) Chief Justice Field, of the Supreme Court, said:

The power of government to exclude foreigners from the country whenever, in its judgment, the public interest requires such exclusion, has been asserted in repeated instances and never denied by the executive or legislative departments.

In the same case Chief Justice Field cites with approval a letter written by Mr. Marcy, Secretary of State under President Pierce, to our minister to Switzerland:

Every society possesses the undoubted right to determine who shall compose its members and it is exercised by all nations, both in peace and in war. It may always be questioned whether a resort to this power is warranted by the circumstances or what department of the government is empowered to assert it, but there can be no doubt but that it is possessed by all nations and that each may decide for itself when the occasion arises demanding its exercise.

This same doctrine was enunciated by Mr. Evarts, Secretary of State under President Hayes, and later by Mr. Frelinghuysen, Secretary of State under President Arthur, who write:

This Government can not contest the right of foreign governments to exclude * * * American citizens from their shores.

Sharing the belief that our Supreme Court has correctly stated the rule of international law as applied to a nation's internal affairs, I can find no serious complaint with a policy that shall annex a resolution to the treaty redefining an established doctrine of the law of nations. This action of the Senate, in my opinion, would not be an amendment nor change of treaty in substance requiring ratification. While a work of supererogation, if found comforting, it would have its own reward.

A stronger reason interposes its unyielding force, and that is that questions of a domestic character will never arise to embarrass this Nation for the reason that the other members of great white race, the dominant peoples of the league in the sense of civilization and power, are as jealous of their sovereign rights to adjust and decide all domestic questions as are we.

In fine, we have been told that our sovereignty has been dangerously diminished, the Monroe doctrine endangered; that we have surrendered our control over certain vital domestic matters; that we could be plunged into war without a declaration of Congress.

No one of these statements is believed by the advocates of the league to have a foundation in fact. Therefore, by the avenue of reservations in the form of interpretations, these questions could be placed beyond the pale of controversy. Action of this character would require no ratification by the other powers, as it would constitute only a restatement of that which already adheres in the covenant.

Mr. President, the world is so impoverished of substance and wasted of man power and economic force as to be incapable of a serious conflict of arms for decades beyond the life of any of the Members of this Senate who are to pass upon the terms of peace, and may we not with almost certain security of peace take time and give deliberations to necessary amendments and changes in the form and character of the constitution of the league? The constitution of the league is not the final and unalterable judge of the world's opinion; it is the present repository of a world desire to create a moral and economic force calculated to act as an insuperable barrier against future armed conflicts. The constitution contains nothing of the finality of the historical laws of the Medes and the Persians. It is simply an instrument for the execution of some of the terms imposed by the treaty of peace—the establishment of a moral force to bring on this earth a permanent peace. Time opens the way and presents opportunity for all needed amendments. The present is crying for mankind to introduce some institution to lessen the probabilities of future wars. Let us not fail to accept the opportunity to unite with other enlightened peoples to bring into existence this ideal that has ever yearned in the human heart and in the bosom of the heroic dead who have yielded their lives to the demands of brutal wars.

The constitution of the league should be the fundamental law of nations, similar in operation in a universal field to our own organic law. Necessarily such a document can only define general principles for the conduct of governments, leaving matters of procedure and administrative detail to rules to be promulgated by the council and general assembly.

Within this league will ripen a new code of international law and justice that will guide the nations of the world by the path that leads to peaceful settlements of all international disputes that will avoid controversies which result in war.

Mr. President, in a discussion of this great subject I have taken the position that all rational men hate war and love peace and would commit their lives to the perpetuation and establishment of any scheme in which they had utter confidence that would bring into existence universal peace and its sublime rewards, and therefore I have not attempted to paint the manifold blessings which will in my judgment come from a creation of this society of peace. But, on the contrary, I have been content to discuss some of the weaknesses and fallacies of the arguments of those who honestly differ with the advocates of the league of nations.

From this thought, born of the force that reflects the pains and burdens of a cruel war, will grow an international structure that

shall protect humanity from the savagery of conflict so long as mankind and his institutions endure.

You say this is a hope founded on faith. Yes; so long as faith abides, the fruits of faith ripen and flourish. The peoples of the world are heartstricken with sorrow, and upon their energies rests the burden of a ponderous tax that will require many decades of patient toil to absorb. This occasion is too serious for anger and recrimination, too big for partisanship, too full of good for personal consideration. Let this country be committed to a step in the direction of everlasting peace, and it is my sincere belief that the league of nations is the greatest step the world has ever taken toward peace; therefore I shall support the league, as it is the hope of the world.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the Senator from Oregon, who has just delivered to us a very thoughtful and excellent address, whether I am correct in understanding him that the proper way to write into, not the treaty, as I understand him, but to write into the record a particular understanding would be by interpretations instead of by reservations.

Before the Senator commits himself unreservedly to that proposition, I want to call his attention to an opinion by the Supreme Court of the United States, which I sent for some 10 or 15 minutes ago, but which has just arrived, and therefore I can not call his attention to the specific language; but it is the case of the New York Indians against The United States, where the Supreme Court laid down the rule that you could not do that thing for the reason that explanatory interpretations were the mere ex parte expressions of one of the parties to the contract and had no effect at all upon the contract, and that the contract would have to be construed according to its terms. [Reading:]

It appears by the records of the proceedings of the Senate that several amendments were there made to said treaty, including a new article; that the ratification was made subject to a proviso, the text of which is stated in the opinion of the court; and that in the official publication of the treaty, and in the President's proclamation announcing it, all the amendments except said proviso were published as part of the treaty, and it was certified that "the treaty, as so amended, is word for word as follows," omitting the proviso. Held, that it is difficult to see how the proviso can be regarded as part of the treaty or as limiting at all the terms of the grant.

I do not know whether the Senator is familiar with this case or not. It is reported in One hundred and seventieth United States.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have some familiarity with that decision. I have very carefully looked through the digest of the Supreme Court cases as to treaties with the Indians, and there are a number in point. That opinion absolutely supports my contention. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania perhaps did not grasp my position. A proviso, an addition, an amendment, a reservation, or whatever it may be called, that enlarges the scope of a treaty or amends it in substance can not be made at all without resubmission to the parties; but an explanatory statement of anything already in a treaty is not an amendment or a reservation. That was the distinction I was trying to draw. As I say, Mr. President, I am one of those who contend that the Monroe doctrine is already preserved in the covenant, but I say it will be harmless to restate it; that it is already there, but it might find its reward in comforting some of the timid minds that oppose the covenant.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, the foremost question in the minds of the American people to-day is, "What can we do, if anything, to prevent future wars?" The question is pertinent and is now up for decision. Have we reached the time in the history of the world when mankind shall be ruled by law and order or by the sword?

The greatest question the Senate of the United States has been asked to consider since the formation of the Government itself is before us now, coupled with consideration of a treaty, the magnitude of which has never had an equal. They are presented to us to adopt or reject.

We are here to-day to study and discuss the plans worked out at the peace table at Versailles, unanimously presented to us by the representatives of the civilized nations of the world, who spent many months in its consideration. It is a question which will affect the welfare and happiness of more people in the United States in future years than any that has heretofore been considered.

They have presented us with this wonderful document—this league of nations plan—as their conclusions. How strange it has been in our imagination and how intricate our conceptions of its provisions until we have received it. But it has come at last, and we find on careful study that its obligations and requirements are reasonably plain and clear.

President Wilson said in his speech when presenting it to the commission constituted by the preliminary peace conference that the simplicity of the document "seems to be one of its

chief virtues." He further said that it was a "definite guaranty of peace. It is a definite guaranty by word against aggression. It is a definite guaranty against the things which have come near bringing the whole structure of civilization unto ruin."

And so, my friends, we are to-day face to face with what we are asked to do, and upon each of us rests a solemn, sacred duty; and we will do our duty as we see it.

The foundation idea of this league of nations, as I see it, is to force all treaties between nations out into the open so that the people of all nations may know what is going on between their government and other governments, and thereby give them an opportunity to have something to say in the settlement of any differences that may arise in the adjustment of the same, instead of having everything done by their rulers, which has caused most of the trouble in the world in past ages. This is a great step in the right direction and will no doubt make the people of all countries inclined to perform their obligations and agreements with other nations. If for any reason they do not live up to their promises, this league of nations, interwoven with the peace treaty, will surely encourage them to do so, because there will be force enough behind it to compel them if necessary.

I think we all realize to a great extent that fear of the law—publicity and punishment—is among the most powerful inducements for men or nations to obey the laws of the land. The real object of this covenant is to encourage nations, and, if necessary, compel them, to live up to their treaties and prevent future wars.

The entire world has been shaken to its foundations in the past four years by the greatest war in the history of mankind. The lands of Europe have been bathed in blood. On battle fields and in the seas sleep millions of its victims. Destruction and want cover Europe to-day, and famine and desolation reign everywhere. Fifty thousand of our boys are buried in that land and many thousands more lie under our own skies. A hundred billion dollars will be our price to pay when we are through, and we had made only a beginning when victory was won. Our country knows practically nothing of the horrors of it all. Can you reason that we gained anything by helping to conquer a people who sought to enslave the world if we still permit old conditions to exist, and thereby make it probable that the same great sacrifice will have to be made again?

Let me repeat what Maj. Louis W. Bicknell, of Webster, S. Dak., who has just returned from France, related to me this morning.

He tells me that on a trip the first of this month through the sector in which the Canadian and English troops operated in the Battle of the Somme in 1916 he learned that the men engaged in cleaning up the ground still find hidden in the woods and marshes the bodies of men who fell more than two years ago. The country, he says, presents a spectacle which can not be described. Not a single building stands in the city of Lens, once a prosperous mining center of 30,000 people. Even the old graves of the dead were burst open by shells and bombs. The village of Vimy does not exist. In Arras not a house is untouched. The cathedral is a wreck and ruin. The city of Albert is only a pile of rubbish. Going from Paris toward Arras the factories which once gave employment to the workers are all ruined. Conditions are thus briefly described by a reliable eyewitness.

Germany thus violated with fiendish ruthlessness all the rules of war which she was pledged to respect. Ought not civilization to league the nations against the perpetration of such atrocities?

The discussion of this proposed league of nations has been going on in this body and by the press and pulpit for months. Many misrepresentations have been made. The country has been bewildered and confused, and no wonder, because it has been attacked by its enemies everywhere. This body has been a sort of "resolution school," with resolutions introduced by the opponents of this measure, with the hope in their hearts, no doubt, that some of them might stumble on to a resting place and find some logical reason to present to the people why it should not be adopted. But I do not think anyone has been really deceived, except it be those whose prejudices make them willing to be deceived.

I recognize that there are those among us who conscientiously hold to the view that the policy of our Government should still be that of noninterference with foreign affairs. Those who hold this view are not necessarily critics of this particular document, but are opposed to a league of any kind. The opinions of all such, conscientiously held, are entitled to the highest respect and consideration.

Let me recall what must be evident to every observing Member of this body, that long before we had been asked to do any

particular thing the fight against this covenant commenced. It began before it was framed, before the delegates had taken their seats around the table at Versailles, and it has increased with increasing fury since it began. But I believe it has been generally recognized by the people at all times that in its early stages it was more a fight against President Wilson than against the league of nations itself.

I desire especially to direct my remarks from the viewpoint of our moral and national duty, and would not forget our obligation to provide material safeguards for our Nation. My Bible tells me that as we sow so shall we reap. I am just old fashioned enough to believe it. I believe that principle applies also to nations as well as individuals. And I do not believe that any government not based on morality and justice can long endure. Our Nation has been sowing for many years past. Now we are beginning to reap what we have sown. Let us not think we can escape our responsibilities. Some day, some time, and in some way we have got to pay the price, and I sometimes think the day of settlement is nearer than we think.

We are told by some Members of Congress, and the opponents of this document, that now the war is closed European troubles are no concern of ours; that we should stand out and not become mixed up in their affairs; that we are the greatest Nation on earth, amply able to take care of ourselves; that we do not need them, but that they need us. Aside from the fact that we are the greatest Nation on earth, I am not able to subscribe to any such doctrine. We are great, of course we are, and that we are strong no one denies. Even Germany admits that; but it is true that no nation or man has ever been or ever will be strong enough to stand alone. That is the reasoning of a selfish man or nation, and its acceptance would bring upon us the just condemnation of all liberty-loving people. It is exactly the same line of argument that has been used among the nations in ages past. It destroys the morals of a people and encourages wars such as we just passed through. It is the basis of that reprehensible sentiment now prevalent in Germany and which makes her an unrepentant nation to-day.

We all know that we were drawn into this war by the attack of Germany upon our moral sentiment as well as the industries of our country through the treachery of foreign ambassadors, the destruction of our commerce, and the murder on the high seas of our women and children. And so, my friends, if we are opposed to an alliance with other great nations to prevent war—from the arguments referred to—if we have reached a time when we really believe that a war in Europe is no concern of ours, then we might as well at once prepare for another, for the actions logically to follow such a position will be the same as have always been taken in olden times, and will of necessity encourage future wars, for our position will be exactly the same as have caused most of the wars for the past 2,000 years.

History tells us that ancient empires swept away peoples with resistless force and little opposition. They also were strong, but they fell. So it has ever been and so it will continue to be if we follow the ancient policy of selfishness which is always the program of despotism.

Would any of you have us become a party to creating new States, new boundary lines, new small republics, as has been done in a number of instances, and then abandon the peoples and countries we have helped to make free? It does not seem possible that the opponents of this league, who expressed themselves on all occasions as favorable to the war to make the world a fit place in which to live, will not now be ready to help these people stand alone. Such arguments will not go far with the American people. This body must be consistent with its own principles and its own past, and I believe it will.

We have now reached a period in the development of inventions when the greatest cities in America and their people can be destroyed and strangled by poisonous gases and high explosives dropped from the air, without a chance to protect themselves. The ocean can be crossed in two days by squadrons of hydroplanes, which in the future will circle the earth and practically annihilate distance. The isolated position which nature gave to America can no longer be relied on to make us safe from attack by foreign foes. To sustain in any degree the argument that has been advanced about America standing alone, those who are interested are met by the credible information that even since the signing of the armistice the destructive power of the aeroplane has increased manifold and that greater destructive powers are being accomplished every day.

The next war, should it come, will be fought almost entirely from the air and under the water. The old bravery of soldiers in open warfare will be no more. It will be so fierce, so destructive, so terrible in its consequences that the power of good government may cease to exist. We may help to destroy our own institutions, our own Government, and hate, power, brute force,

and anarchy may again rule the world. Then the destruction of the English-speaking race will be complete. It is time people became awakened to the situation as it exists to-day, and not allow themselves to be lulled to sleep in imaginary security.

Surely it can not be that with such knowledge in our possession we will not realize this great danger to our country, but stand here and oppose plans presented to us by the best intellects of the world as a remedy, or at least a partial remedy, after months of careful consideration and study, a plan to hold these awful consequences in check, and which if successful will end all this murderous warfare perhaps forever.

It does not seem to me there should be a single man in this body, knowing these facts, knowing that under the terms of this covenant any signatory nation may withdraw from it in two years if it so desires, who will favor sitting back in his dignity and independence on the theory that it is no part of our business to mix up with European affairs.

There may have been some, but very few wars have been fought that could not have been avoided by arbitration. And settlements of disputes which led to war had to be made after the war was over, just as is being done in this case.

Mr. President, I have always been a firm believer that the things that would keep us out of war would be agreements similar to this proposed covenant. I was in favor of the plan inaugurated by Mr. Bryan a few years ago when Secretary of State. I was friendly to the score or more treaties ratified between our country and various other countries for the advancement of general peace. And I am in favor of this plan for the league of nations, composed by representatives of the leading nations of the world, and I would be favorable to and vote for any plan given us by all the leading statesmen of the world after six months of deliberation.

We recognize that not everything in this document suits us. We would all probably make some changes if we could. I know that if I had the power the first thing I would do would be to eliminate Germany for the next 50 years or, at least, until she had shown some different feeling from what she has shown since the war closed. I would not permit her to be a partner in this league. She has covered the earth with blood, yet seems to have no sorrow for her crimes. She is not fit to become a member. Her word, her promises, her treaties, have all been false, and, if she were able, she would plunge the world into another war to-morrow if she believed she could emerge from it alive. I do not see how it would be possible for the civilized nations of the world to have any confidence in that people, either in the league or out of it.

According to published reports, some of their leading papers are now printing articles stating that this treaty will not be respected by the German people; that it will be regarded there merely as a "scrap of paper"; but, thank God, there will be force behind it which will change it into a stern reality, which force is the only thing which Germany recognizes as worth consideration.

There is another change in this plan which I would like to see made. I would like to have had an agreement to add to section 8, or to have had a new provision inserted, making it legally impossible for destructive inventions, such as deadly gases, high explosives, and destructive shells, to be ever again made for use in warfare. And that for the future all treacherous, death-dealing, and destructive inventions should be entirely withheld, making the penalty so heavy upon the inventor, the manufacturer, or the seller, as to constitute a complete barrier to all future output of such deadly weapons, because if something of the kind is not done the danger to good government is increased manifold. If you will study this question, I do not believe you can reach any other conclusion. I would go still further. I would destroy all the war material of the world more destructive than the ordinary Winchester or Springfield rifle, because if we permit these inventions to continue and be used for war purposes the danger of world destruction through anarchy and lawlessness will be increased manifold. But, Mr. President, these changes can not be made by us in good faith, because an amendment can not be made or anything eliminated without the necessity of ratification by other members of the league, which would complicate, delay, and entangle matters more than they are now.

My friends, history will repeat itself if something is not done to stay the awful craze that is running wild over the world to-day. You may say you can not see how this can be possible. Neither could we understand a few months ago how war which has destroyed the lives of 20,000,000 people and impoverished hundreds of millions more could come upon us almost over night. Neither could a million mothers understand why their sons were snatched from them and hurled into the trenches of disease and death to keep the world safe from the horrors and

brutalities of the Hun, the consequence of which is that 50,000 of the flower of American youth sleep to-day in the blood-stained fields of Europe.

Wars have cursed the world since the beginning of history; and largely, in my opinion, because of the selfishness and ambitions of rulers and the ignorance of the people; and likewise for the further reason that the false idea has prevailed that war upon other countries was none of their business. Under the old order, with ideas then prevalent, it may be there could be no interference, and this false idea is just what I desire to help change by my vote. Fear of punishment is the one great influence, perhaps the greatest, operating to deter men and nations from unjust and criminal acts. I desire every civilized nation under the sun to be able to say to its neighbors that they shall not do an unjust act to a smaller nation. Under the former rule whenever a powerful nation subdued a smaller one it meant that the robber nation's power for evil was increased. It is my wish that whenever any nation proposes to aggrandize itself at the expense of a weaker one, we may have a league which will call a halt and, if necessary, destroy the offending nation's power for evil. That is what I want, and I especially want my vote on this league of nations to help put the shackles on Germany, Bulgaria, Turkey, and all the renegade despotisms of the Old World, and to have them brought to a realizing sense that it is their lot to wear them forever.

Do any of you believe that if England, France, Italy, Japan, and the United States had had power to say to Germany in 1914, with all the authority of a solemn league, "You shall not invade Belgium, and you shall respect the rights of man," that this war would have been begun? I do not, and I believe you are in agreement with me. But we did not have the right. England and France did not have the right. There was no league of nations, and that is the reason why the great World War was not prevented. What I wish now is that we may all have that right by international agreement with other civilized countries of the world, and see if by this means we may not prevent such catastrophes in the future. We owe it to our children to take the step. Let the allied nations disposed to justice decree that in the years to come no nation reveling in power shall usurp the rights of the weak.

We boast to-day of our advancement in all the things which make the world better, our great schools of learning and our religious institutions, all of which are legitimate objects of national pride. If we acknowledge anything of worth in the conclusions of philosophy and religion, why question the accepted fact that moral force exceeds the force of the brute? Is it true that our Nation in this twentieth century can not devise a plan to achieve justice without following the tactics of the Hun? Remember your obligations to generations unborn. If we fail the world here, I shall look upon it as the greatest national sin we have ever committed, and I shall likewise feel that we have been deliberately neglecting our material interests as well.

Have you ever considered the position of danger we would be in if the great commercial nations enter into this league and we remain aloof? Our commerce extends to the limits of the entire globe, and we desire that our merchant marine shall penetrate to all ports of the world. Suppose we refuse to enter this league, which has for its object the protection of the world from the aggressions of predatory nations. Why would we not be regarded with enmity and suspicion? Our great commercial interests, rich lands, our favored geographical position, would soon place us in the position of standing alone, with the other civilized nations combined against us. The time might come when there would be a vast combination against us to refill their treasuries and discharge their debts. To my mind, such an opportunity should not be given under any pretext, and this should be given careful consideration in determining our course regarding this alliance.

We have another reason for urging this compact. In the Far East at this time signs are increasing that Bolshevism with its reign of terror may yet without our help overrun Europe. The armies of France, England, and our allies are the only influence now stemming the tide. We entered this war in good faith for the purpose of making the world safe, not for lawlessness, but for democracy with its law and order. Will they believe we were acting in good faith as we claim if we abandon them now when, with the possible exception of time when we were at their side on the decisive battle field, they are at the most critical time in their life's history? And, Mr. President, if France is at a critical time from this cause, the crisis is also upon England and all the civilized countries, including our own. If France should be engulfed, the calamity is not her own alone. The danger of it hovers over us as well as them.

Paragraph 10 has been more largely commented upon and cited as a dangerous paragraph than anything else in the covenant. Let us see how it reads:

ARTICLE 10.

The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

Mr. President, I am unable to see anything in this that is not perfectly plain and clear. Further, I am unable to see how it would be possible to have a covenant at all with any virtue or effect without the provisions which this paragraph embodies.

Opponents of the league have commented on Washington's views as expressed in his Farewell Address, advising against "entangling alliances" with foreign nations. This advice, Mr. President, was sound and wise for his time and the then existing circumstances, but conditions change as time goes on. Men change to meet those conditions. That which was best and wise over a hundred years ago is not necessarily best for us to-day. We love our country, we cherish its history, but that should not prevent us from seeing new conditions and duties which have been forced upon us. The truly progressive man permits no cloud to obscure his vision and knows that part of the past which is worth preserving and perceives that which is obsolete. Europe is calling for our help, and in helping her we help ourselves. Is it possible that the bloodiest war the world has ever seen has taught us nothing? Will not our Nation profit by the experiences just passed through? The world looks to America to-day for our answer as they look to no other nation on the globe. Will we answer them "yes" or "no"? The only hope that I can see is in this league of nations, to direct the world into the ways of peace. Have you who oppose this measure a better plan? If so, what is it? What do you propose to do for the millions of innocent, law-abiding men, women, and children of Europe? What is your plan to relieve them from conditions worse than death? Can you be a good citizen of America and not be a good citizen of the world?

So I say in conclusion we may say to the other nations of the earth, "We do not wish to get mixed up with your affairs. Your wars are no concern of ours. You go your way and we will go ours." But if we do, we will both inherit and deserve the hate of all the millions of honest, liberty-loving and God-fearing people of Europe, who look to America to save them and their countries from destruction.

I am going to vote for this league of nations on account of the protection of my family in future years. And when I vote for the good of my family, as I see it, I vote for the good of your family and for the good of every family in our great country. I shall vote for it because every German sympathizer in the world wishes it to fail; because every Bolshevik, every "I. W. W." every man in the world who does not believe in law and order would vote against it, as they would vote against anything to compel them to obey the laws of God and man. Germany, Turkey, Bulgaria, and what is left of Austria-Hungary would like to see it fail. And I do not propose that my vote shall be registered with that group.

None of us can see further than to-day. The future is sealed to our vision. The good that this league may do for our country we do not know. But those of us who favor it hope and believe it will be great. And, seeing that way and believing that way, the finger of duty points only in one direction. And so in casting my vote on this proposed covenant of the world I shall cast it with a consciousness of having discharged my duty. We are under obligations to every citizen of our land to bring this peace about at the earliest possible moment. We owe this to every man who went to the defense of our country. We owe it to every mother in this great land who gave her sons for freedom. We promise it to every soldier living and every soldier dead, and I am ready to vote to redeem my promise.

PROPAGANDA ON PACKING INDUSTRY.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] has given notice of a speech to be delivered at this time. I gave notice yesterday that I would try to address the Senate at some time when I could get the floor on the league of packers' propaganda. I do not want to take the time of the Senator from New Hampshire, except to put in a telegram or two about the matter. I realize that any speech I have to make on the subject will have to be made between speeches on the league of nations.

I said on yesterday that, in my judgment, the greatest propaganda that ever had been inaugurated in this country is now in full swing with reference to the bills which have been introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] and by myself for some regulations of the packers. Telegrams have poured in

to Senators and Representatives in Congress by the hundreds, and letters likewise, from people who know nothing about these bills, having been stimulated to do it by the active agents of the packers all over the United States. They have reached the banks now, and telegrams and letters are pouring in from the banks.

I say that the packers have agents in their employ traveling around the United States interviewing retail merchants, telling them that these bills will destroy them, borrowing letterheads from certain merchants to send in letters to Members of Congress, stimulating commercial bodies and banks to believe that these bills will simply destroy the Nation. This battle is going to become a battle to find out whether the packers with their combination and their monopoly are so strong that they can prevent practically the consideration of bills to regulate them.

I have interviews here with a manager of the packers in a certain city, one in which he virtually states that it is nonsense to believe that there can be any regulation of the packers; that they are just as large as the Government. They form the most powerful monopoly that we have ever had in this country.

I am not claiming any perfection for these bills. I am not claiming that the packers should not be heard. There will be extensive hearings. The bills are in the committee now, and the hearings will not commence for a month. I am simply anxious that when Senators receive such telegrams and letters they may know that they are inspired by these gentlemen who are trying to get a monopoly upon everything the people of the country have to eat.

I have trespassed enough upon the time of the Senator from New Hampshire, but I want to have this telegram read at the desk as illustrating the methods which are now in use, together with these two letters, one from New Mexico and the other from New Hampshire, illustrating other methods. As the debate on the league of nations proceeds, I shall try between speeches, every once in a while, to get something into the RECORD on this matter, in the hope that it may get before the American people, so that they may know the kind of propaganda that is going on to influence legislation and the inspiration of that propaganda, because the question will eventually come to the Congress whether there is power enough in the people of the country, the everyday people, who find themselves faced with a monopoly that is attempting to control everything they eat, to control that monopoly, and the battle line will be drawn, and men will take their places on one side or the other of it.

I ask that the telegram be read and that the two letters be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAPPER in the chair). If there is no objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

CUMBERLAND, Md., July 21, 1919.

Senator W. S. KENYON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Armour Co. representatives actively working this section among retail grocers influencing them write or telegraph Washington opposition to Kenyon bill (S. 2202) in Senate, introduced to prevent monopoly food products by Big Five Packers. If you are flooded with protests in their behalf you will know what pressure is being brought to bear by Big Five Packers. Just advised using same methods through the South. No doubt all over the country many retail grocers may be influenced. Communicate with you their behalf by smooth tongued trained representatives. One of Armour's representatives admitted all their salesmen were called into meeting. No doubt they will be instructed along this line as well as other distributors. Food products are beginning to feel pressure of control in canned goods. Rice, salmon, and many other lines other than meats. Unless Kenyon bill is passed we believe it will practically be but one source of supply. Food commodities competition is the life of trade and will be obliterated. We only ask to be placed on a competitive basis and that special privileges enjoyed by the Big Five Packers in transportation be discontinued.

THE KENNEWEG COMPANY WHOLESALE GROCERS,
JOHN G. LYNN, President.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., July 16, 1919.

Mr. ALFRED H. BECKMANN,
Secretary, National Wholesale Grocers' Association,
No. 6 Harrison Street, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: The Armour Packing Co. is asking the retailers in the city to let them have the use of their letterheads for the purpose of preparing letters to our Senators and Congressmen for the retailers' signatures. These letters are intended as an indorsement of the packers' privileges in use of refrigerator or peddler cars. We doubt if they will be able to obtain many indorsements as our retailers' association is cautioning its members against signing the letters which the packers are preparing. At any rate, it will be advisable for the association to make the wholesalers in the country acquainted with above so they will put their customers on their guard.

Yours, very truly,

CHARLES ILFELD COMPANY,
MAX NARDHANS, President.

KEENE, N. H., July 18, 1919.

NATIONAL WHOLESALE GROCERS' ASSOCIATION,
New York City.

GENTLEMEN: We are inclosing with this letter a copy of letter which one of our banking friends received from one of the large packers in the West, and which is self-explanatory.

You will note that the opposition which they are trying to create to the passage of the Kenyon bill is of a somewhat subtle nature. We have been informed that one of the large packers intends to get petitions signed by a large number of retailers protesting against the passage of this bill.

We thought you might be interested in having this information, showing that the packers are not asleep by any means, but that they appear to be anxious in a quiet way to create a public sentiment in their favor, if possible.

Yours, truly,

THE HOLBROOK GROCERY CO.,
E. S. HOLBROOK, President.

LOUISVILLE, Ky., July 18, 1919.

The NATIONAL WHOLESALE GROCERS' ASSOCIATION,
New York City, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: We are informed by one of our salesmen that in Harlan County, Ky. (a district in which the packers operate extensively), Armour & Co. are trying to get the merchants to sign some kind of blanks to put up a rebuttal by the packers in complaint lodged by the wholesale grocers before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

We do not know the exact nature of this document, but we are trying to get further details from our salesman. As soon as we can find out anything further we will let you know.

We give you this information thinking that it may be of some value to you.

Yours, very truly,

ALTSHEIER & Co.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I simply wish to add that that is a sample of other telegrams which I am receiving. I desire further to say that the unanimity with which the minds of the people of the country have worked against this bill is perfectly marvelous. There are telegrams sent from Maine and from the State of Washington here to Congress on the same day and in the same language; and letters are written from various States on the same kind of paper, in the same typewriting, in the same language, and are sent on the same day. It is marvelous how the minds of the people have risen all over this country against this bill at one particular moment.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I am receiving, and I presume every other Senator is receiving, telegrams and letters from merchants and retailers all over the country similar to those which have been received by the Senator from Iowa and which he has read. The packers, through their own agents, are getting up these letters and telegrams at their own expense and sending them here to Senators.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. MOSES obtained the floor.

Mr. WATSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Beckham	Gerry	McKellar	Sheppard
Calder	Hale	Moses	Sherman
Capper	Harding	New	Shields
Curtis	Harris	Newberry	Smith, Md.
Dial	Henderson	Norris	Stanley
Dillingham	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nugent	Sutherland
Edge	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Swanson
Elkins	Kenyon	Page	Trammell
Fall	King	Phelan	Walsh, Mont.
France	Lenfoot	Phipps	Watson
Gay	Lodge	Ransdell	Wolcott

Mr. KING. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] is detained by illness.

Mr. GERRY. The senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] are absent on official business.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-four Senators having answered to their names, there is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of absent Senators.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. SMOOT, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. THOMAS answered to their names when called.

Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. McNARY, Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. GRONNA, Mr. POINDEXTER, and Mr. KELLOGG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-seven Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, the treaty of peace with Germany was signed at Versailles June 28, but discussion of its provisions, as conjectured or known, began even before any of its negotiators had set out for Paris. The final day of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress was marked by a speech from the senior Senator from Missouri, who took then the strong position which he has since maintained toward the proposed league of nations; and from that day to this the currents of debate, here and elsewhere, have surged about this subject to the exclusion, almost complete, of any other of the stipulations which we are at length called to consider in their final form.

It may be, Mr. President, that this would have followed if the Senator from Missouri had not spoken as he did. It is probable that another voice, perhaps less robust, would have been raised to sound the alarm which the vigilant Senator then set up—and indeed, sir, it is almost certain that the very novelty of the proposal would, in any event, have made the proposed covenant the storm center of discussion which we now know it to be. Contributing to this result is the fact that the covenant of the league of nations was the first portion of the treaty to emerge into pitiless publicity from the diplomatic laboratory where the alchemists of modern world politics were engaged in arriving openly at open covenants in the white light which beat upon a conference table set in a locked and guarded room where wild men shrieked at the keyhole and stones were clattering upon the roof—as one of the conferees has described it; and the attention thus concentrated upon a single portion of the treaty—by no means the longest, the most complicated, or the most important as regards the main task of the conference—has never been even measurably interrupted. The published summary of the treaty as a whole failed to arouse or hold the public mind; and even when a full and well-authenticated text fell under the eye of some of us and finally into the hands of all—not as receivers of stolen goods probably obtained by bribery but as legitimately as any document wrongfully withheld could possibly come into the possession of its rightful custodians—even this failed to divert the ebb and flow of the tidal waves of criticism and defense which have poured across the weather-beaten topic of the league of nations.

The stream of comment has continued to flow in its chosen channel, Mr. President, with but a single ripple—even since the President brought back belatedly and laid before us the instrument he had negotiated, together with his report upon it. Except for the singling out of the sinister and shocking scandal of Shantung by the junior Senator from Nebraska and the clarion blast with which he startled the ears of all Christian citizens, the treaty itself has been only negligibly touched upon by any Senator; and the country has little reason to think that we are here to pass senatorial judgment upon anything of consequence apart from the league of nations.

This is not altogether surprising, Mr. President. The keynote of this debate was not struck in the widely advertised speech of the Senator from Virginia; it was sounded by the President himself four days before the gallant Virginia admiral sailed into the course and hoisted and lowered his flag within the period of a single and none too prolonged session of the Senate.

The President's address to us, on the 10th of July, like all of the addresses he has anywhere made upon the subject of the treaty, was devoted, in space and emphasis, most largely to the league of nations. Only 14 lines of its printed text were devoted to the treaty itself, and his comment upon it was equally vague and apologetic. In consequence, and in line with the trend of debate during the President's absence, the remarks made here during the past two weeks have not departed from the beaten path, except, as I have already pointed out, for the discussion aroused by the Senator from Nebraska, and we have continued to content ourselves with criticism and explanation of the league of nations.

It is therefore pardonable, Mr. President, if I approach another phase of the general topic, contenting myself for the moment with saying only that I am in full accord with the views which the opponents of the league of nations have expressed, that to my mind the proposed covenant presents features which endanger our rights of sovereignty, which shackle our freedom of judgment and action, and which bind us to perpetual observance of stipulations, uncertain and unknown, to be laid upon us by a foreign concert acting under the most sinister of all the powers ever exercised by the old order of diplomacy, which we have been told had passed away—the reservation of the unrestricted right to act which the members of the league take to themselves under the provisions of article 15.

Bad, Mr. President, as the covenant of the league of nations is, it is by no means the worst feature of the pact which is before us; and if there are those among us who still persist that the voice of the fathers is more articulate and alluring than the call of those voices which we are told infest the air, if there are those who continue to think that Washington's Farewell Address is a nobler document than any recently produced at Versailles, I counsel these to turn their attention to the body of the treaty itself, and to learn from its many and complicated stipulations the full extent of the duties it seeks to lay upon us, the difficulties it will try to make us solve, and the inextricable thicket of complications into which it will thrust us.

After all, Mr. President, it is the entire treaty which we must consider, and it is the entire treaty which we will find worthy of a far closer scrutiny than any of us yet have given to it. In the form in which it has come to the Committee on Foreign Relations the English text comprises 267 printed pages of census size, of which nearly 6 are devoted to a preamble, a recital of the powers signatory, and a list of their plenipotentiaries—this last beginning with our own chief negotiator, "acting in his own name and by his own proper authority," and ending with the German "Dr. Bell, Minister of the Empire," who, in the absence of further distinguishing title or prognomen, may have sought thus to prepare an alibi against the possible anger of his constituents. Its more than 80,000 words are divided into 15 parts, which contain 49 sections, 26 chapters, 15 annexes, 4 maps, 3 tables, and 440 articles.

In it are considerations of many things—of "shoes and ships and sealing wax, of cabbages and kings." The wide world has been combed to find objects of reparation with which to carry out the doctrine of no annexations and no indemnities, and neither schoolhouses in China, nor villas in Egypt, nor manuscripts from Medina, nor skulls from East Africa have been overlooked. In short, Mr. President, the most ardent of special agents of our own Treasury, seeking for additional items of taxation from a rich Republic, could not have been more diligent than the peace commissioners at Paris in digging out remote and oftentimes unrelated properties, rights, and privileges with which to swell the treasure chest of booty.

In the treaty, described in words and laid down upon its accompanying maps, are new boundaries for Germany, for France, for Belgium, for Luxemburg, for Switzerland, for Denmark, and for East Prussia—to name the nations which were before the war; and for Poland and Czechoslovakia—to name those which the treaty will contribute to set up. It creates a new free city; it optimistically looks forward to new Russian States; it roams the plains, sails the seas, delves into the earth, and soars into the sky; it opens prisons and it guards graves; submarine cables and wireless telegraphic plants are subject to its terms; dyestuffs and drugs, coal and chemicals, Huns, horses, and huntsmen alike come within its purview; books, boundaries, and bullets; contracts, cattle, cotton, and claims; deeds, debts, and duties; finance, fire insurance, and fortifications; guns, goats, guaranties, and governments; missions, mines, and mixed commissions; navies, negotiable instruments, and natural products; ports, prizes, and penalties; railroads, recruiting, and rivers; sheep, submarines, stock exchanges, and social insurance; tunnels, tonnage, and trials; vessels, victuals, and the Vistula; warships, waterways, woman suffrage, and Wilhelm II—in short, Mr. President, the alphabet and alliteration alike are agonized in an attempt to deal adequately with merely a topical index to this instrument which we are asked to ratify in haste lest we break the heart of the world.

The main task of the treaty is to impose the terms of peace on Germany—and this it does rigorously. From Germany is demanded the surrender of Alsace-Lorraine; of German-Poland; of her rights in Moresnet; of her title over the Kreise of Eupen and of Malmedy; of all her overseas possessions and concessionary rights; of all her suzerain or supervisory privileges in Luxemburg; of her administrative authority in, and probably the ultimate surrender of, the Saar Basin; the exploitation privileges of the ports of Strasburg and of Kehl; of all rights and titles to a considerable portion of Silesian territory; the surrender of sovereign rights in East Prussia; of complete right and title to the territory of Memel, the city of Danzig and territory adjacent thereto; the absolute surrender of rule in Northern Schleswig, and further surrender of titular grasp upon the rest of the ancient duchy, unless its inhabitants shall determine to continue under German authority; the destruction of all military works upon the islands of Heligoland and Dune, the complete renunciation of concessionary rights and titles in all overseas possessions; renunciation of all rights in conventions and agreements relating to equatorial Africa; the relinquishment of all claims for indemnity under the Boxer treaty; the relinquishment of real and personal property, arms and munitions, vessels

and wharves, in Chinese territory; the return of astronomical instruments taken from China nearly 20 years ago; the abrogation of leases for German concessions in various Chinese cities; the waiving of all claims against China and other powers for the internment of German nationals; the relinquishment of all privileges under international arrangements regarding Liberia; the surrender of all rights, titles, and privileges procured in Morocco, together with all property and possessions in the Sherifian Empire; the transfer of German shares in the Moroccan State Bank; the recognition of the English protectorate in Egypt; the abrogation of all German privileges in that country and the surrender of all German property there; the relinquishment, in favor of Japan, of all German rights, titles, and privileges in Shantung; the reduction of military, naval, and air forces to a mere skeleton, with severe restrictions regarding the period of enlistment and service, the training of men, the manufacture or store of guns and munitions; the restriction of the means of military education; the surrender of the right of military, naval, or air missions to leave Germany; the destruction of all fortified works in a wide area to the east of the Rhine; the surrender of warships, auxiliaries, submarines, docks, and aircraft; the breaking up of warships now under construction, together with all their machinery and equipment; a restriction upon the quantity of naval arms, munitions, and raw materials, and its storing in designated places; the surrender of hydrographic information concerning the channels and waters between the Baltic and North Sea, and a renunciation of rights to install guns on maritime routes between these waters; limitation upon the use of high-power wireless; absolute restriction upon the employment of military and naval air forces, and proscription against the keeping of any military dirigible, together with the surrender of all military and naval aeronautic material, except a few machines to be used exclusively in the search for submarine mines.

In addition to the geographic, military, and naval renunciations which Germany is called upon to make, she also accepts, at the affirmation of the Allies, responsibility for loss and damage incurred during the war and undertakes the restoration of Belgium with a reimbursement of all sums which Belgium has borrowed from allied governments, each of such payments to be made in the form of bonds; she agrees to pay, in the near future, the equivalent of 20,000,000,000 gold marks, and as further guaranty for the carrying out of the reparation exacted agrees to a direct application of her economic resources; and to assure these reparations, under the specifications which the treaty lays down, she undertakes to enact and enforce any legislation, orders, or decrees which may be necessary.

Under the heading of compensation which may be exacted from the vanquished foe is included damage to persons and surviving dependents arising through personal injury, or to civilian victims through acts of cruelty, violence, or maltreatment to allied civilians, either in German territory or in that occupied by German forces, reparation for all injury and compensation in the nature of pensions.

And among the items of reparation which may be exacted is the reimbursement of all costs which may accrue from pensions or compensation systems established by the successful belligerents.

Germany is forced to recognize the right for replacement, ton for ton and class for class, of all merchant vessels lost or damaged by reason of the war, to make atonement by absolute cession of its property in German merchant ships yet afloat, and to build, as soon as may be, new tonnage in an amount which shall be specified. In this connection Germany waives all claims of any description in respect to detention, employment, loss, or damage to any German ships, except as provided by the armistice; and equally waives all claim to vessels or cargoes sunk in naval action and subsequently salvaged.

Reiterating her obligation to devote her economical resources to the physical restoration of the areas invaded by German forces, Germany is further required, to the extent which the devastated powers may determine, to make restoration, or restitution, for animals, machinery, tools, building material, furniture, heating apparatus, and the like; and also to deliver horses, cattle, sheep, and goats to France, and to Belgium, in a number which the treaty fixes definitely. Furthermore, Germany will be compelled to deliver to France 7,000,000 tons of coal per year for 10 years, to Belgium 8,000,000 tons of coal per year for an equal period, and a varying quantity of coal to Italy up to the year 1929—and the treaty fixes the price to be paid for the same. Benzol, coal tar, sulphate of ammonia, and other products of distillation in fixed quantities must also be delivered and paid for under the terms which the treaty sets forth; dyestuffs and chemical drugs are subject to the same provisions; and no less than 13 submarine cables

pass from the possession of the German Government and her nationals to the principal allied and associated powers. I have already spoken of the skull of the Sultan Mkwawa, which is to be handed over to King George of England; and in addition are the French flags and political papers taken from France in the war of 1870; the books, maps, and manuscripts from the University of Louvain; paintings from Ghent; and the copy of the Koran taken from Medina, which must now be placed in the keeping of that newest of potentates in a world made safe for democracy—his Majesty, the King of the Hedjaz. Besides this, Germany is obligated to pay the total cost of all armies in occupied German territory from the date of the armistice, including the general cost of all administrative and technical services connected therewith, and for the carrying out of all these reparations a carefully thought-out list of priority is made in the treaty.

There are many other items of reparation which the treaty contains, including the sum which the Reichsbank was to receive in behalf of the Ottoman public debt, the sums in gold transferred to the German Government as security for or in connection with loans made to Austria, and the restitution of benefits disclosed by the treaties of Bucharest and of Brest-Litovsk, and the German Government further obligates itself to possess itself of the rights of its nationals in any concession operating in Russia, China, Turkey, Austria-Hungary, and Bulgaria, to transfer them to the allied powers, and to accept credit for the accrued sum in the list of charges which the treaty imposes upon Germany. The powers also will take from Germany under the treaty any claim she may have for payment or repayment by the Governments of Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey, while to the Government of Brazil she guarantees the payment of a sum due for sales of coffee made in Germany before the war.

Germany is further forced to agree that products from allied Governments entering German territory shall be treated upon the most-favored-nation terms, and that no indirect means of customs regulations shall operate to change this. In addition, the products of Alsace and Lorraine for five years shall be admitted to Germany free of duty, while Alsace and Lorraine will receive from Germany free of all export duties certain yarns, tissues, textile materials, and other products desirable for the maintenance of the industries of Alsace and Lorraine. For 36 months Germany may not increase her customs duties over those of July 31, 1914, upon many of the products then subject to German tariff with the addition of wines, vegetable oils, and other products specialized in French manufacture.

During the period of occupation of any portion of German territory by allied troops this territory shall be subjected to a special customs régime established by the occupying forces.

Unfair competition is also regulated by the treaty, and specific safeguards are thrown about wines and spirits, to the presumable end that the product of French vineyards shall not be subject to German competition—and we, a Nation deliberately made dry, must help to maintain this sanctity of the French wine merchant.

The treaty further provides that Germany shall deliver up all securities and other documents of title held by its nationals and relating to property situated in the territory of any allied power, and all accounts, vouchers, records, and information which concern the investments of allied nationals in properties which have been subjected to exceptional war measures, or to transfer, in any German territory or any territory occupied by her.

In the financial clauses of the treaty all classes of insurance are dealt with, and it is provided that any allied power within a specified time may cancel all contracts of insurance between its nationals and any German insurance company, which latter is compelled to hand over to the power thus acting a proportion of its assets involved in this action. Industrial property forms another subject with which the treaty deals, and by its terms Germany and German nationals are estopped from any claim for rights in industrial, literary, or artistic property, its sale or the use of its products, and each of the allied powers is entitled to impose such limitations and restrictions as it chooses upon the rights of German industrial, literary, or artistic property within its territory.

Free and unrestricted transport of commercial products, without discrimination or preference and with the most-favored-nation treatment, is procured by the treaty for the benefit of the allied powers; and Germany may not refuse to enter into tariffs or combinations of tariffs designed to secure for any allied ports advantages which are similar to those which German ports enjoy. In this connection, the free zones of German ports, as existing prior to the war, must be maintained; and all harbor, lighthouse, or other port charges which shall be estab-

lished for the benefit of any power shall immediately and unconditionally be granted to all the allied powers.

The Elbe, the Oder, the Niemen, and the Danube are internationalized under the treaty; and Germany is compelled to cede to the allied powers tugs, vessels, and other material of all kinds necessary for the utilization of these river systems. The Rhine, like the Danube, is placed under the control of an international commission established by prior convention; and Germany shall deliver to France the river tugs and vessels, docks, warehouses, and other facilities at the port of Rotterdam. To France also are given special rights for the building of weirs upon the right bank of the Rhine, and the like rights are guaranteed to Switzerland, if she shall demand them. In addition to the concessions above noted to be granted at Rotterdam to the French Government, the Czecho-Slovak State is to receive in the ports of Hamburg and Stettin free zones and other facilities upon terms to be fixed by an international commission.

German railroads are equally brought within the treaty's jurisdiction; and Germany binds herself to secure freedom of transit with most-favored-nation treatment, and to display special activity in the establishment of through-ticket service for passengers and their luggage; these activities are to apply equally to emigrants as to tourists; and German railway cars are to be fitted with facilities which shall enable their wide use in international commerce.

The Kiel Canal is internationalized under the terms of the treaty.

As guarantees for the execution of the terms of the treaty, provision is made for armies of occupation during a period of fifteen years, with provision for reoccupation in the event that the German undertakings are not completed within that period.

These, Mr. President, are only a part of the deservedly drastic terms imposed upon Germany by the treaty. They constitute a victor's peace; and with them I have no quarrel. "Vae victis" is the agonizing cry which has gone up from every battle field since the human race learned to fight; and my only criticism of the penalties which I have only in part enumerated is that they were not promptly and rigorously imposed upon a crushed and humiliated foe eight months ago, and that they are now presented to us with the argument that they square "as a whole with the principles agreed upon as a basis of peace."

These principles, Mr. President, have trod a thorny path. First promulgated, under this roof, on the eighth day of January, 1918, they were, we have lately been told, "readily acceded to as the principles to which honorable and enlightened minds everywhere had been bred." They spoke, we have been assured, "the conscience of the world as well as the conscience of America"; but it was with a happiness which the written result does not justify that there fell from the President's lips his "tribute of respect and gratitude" for the "constant effort" of his fellow negotiators "to accommodate the interests they represented to the principles" which all had agreed upon.

This agreement, Mr. President, was almost wholly supposititious, so far as the resultant provisions of the treaty are concerned. We look in vain through its 267 pages for the elusive fourteen points of peace. Open covenants long since took to hiding; the freedom of the seas was treated with scant courtesy at Paris; the establishment of equality-of-trade conditions among nations consenting to the peace is nowhere to be found in this instrument; the earlier doctrine of no annexations and no indemnities long since became a tragic joke; and there remains alone, so far as present negotiations have been reduced to written form, the general association of nations established by specific covenant.

Neither can we find here, Mr. President, any confirmation of the prediction that this treaty was to be written in disregard of the old order of the balance of power and with no element of national commercial greed. The balance of power expressed in geographic terms does not, it is true, appear; but all the elements of greed, national suspicion, and jealousy are only too evident in almost every article of the treaty. "The treaty," says an eminent English commentator, "is triple nonsense. It expects Germany to earn vast sums and to earn them without the right and facility to trade abroad. It expects some Government to impose this servitude on the German workers, yet denies to that Government the army which alone might hold them down in outward obedience. It robs 15,000,000 Germans of subsistence and omits to provide them with a field for emigration."

In short, Mr. President, the sun of commercial expansion in which Germany sought a place passes into total eclipse behind this treaty; and the shackles with which she is to be manacled in her obscurity have been forged with meticulous care by "the forward-looking men" with whom the President was privileged to cooperate at Paris, but whose cooperation was strictly limited to looking out for themselves, while not omitting to see to it

that the United States should be made a full partner in every phase of the enterprise designed for the benefit of the other members of the big five. No one could find fault with this, Mr. President, if it had been done in the open, or if it were now brought to us with no pretense that the deed squares "as a whole with the principles agreed upon as a basis of peace," and that the inevitable compromises "nowhere cut to the heart of any principle."

It naturally follows, Mr. President, that a treaty such as this can not be self-operative; and we have been assured that, if we examine it, we shall find that everywhere throughout its manifold provisions its framers have felt obliged to turn to the league of nations as the indispensable instrumentality for the maintenance of the new order which this instrument purposes to set up. Among the specific results to be secured by use of the indispensable instrumentality of the league have been enumerated to us the establishment of a free city like Danzig; properly safeguarded plebiscites by means of which certain populations at some future date shall choose their sovereignty; certain uniform arrangements for the settlement of anticipated difficulties of final decision for provisions in the treaty itself; the long-continued supervision of the task of reparation which Germany is to undertake; reconsideration and revision of administrative arrangements and restrictions which the treaty prescribes; the throwing of safeguards about the rights of national, racial, and religious minorities; opportunity to limit and regulate military establishments where they are most likely to be maintained; opportunity of effecting complete systematic internationalization of waters and railways necessary to the free economic life of more than one nation; and to clear many of the normal channels of commerce.

The evidence of the manner in which these great results are to be achieved through the indispensable instrumentality of the league of nations will be found best of all, Mr. President, in a study of the text of the treaty itself; and before taking up any detailed recital of treaty provisions, which may prove to be tedious, but which, nevertheless, it is our duty to scrutinize before we give our consent, I wish to call the attention of the Senate and the country to the manner in which the signatories to the instrument have separated themselves into two distinct groups—the first comprising the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, and everywhere throughout the treaty described as the "principal allied and associated powers"; and the second, all the other belligerents—with the exception of Costa Rica, whose absence from the peace table has not yet been explained—to the number of 22, and "constituting, with the principal powers mentioned above, the allied and associated powers." We find occasional mention in the treaty of another group, described as the "allied powers," presumably the former entente, and all three groups are found to perform vital functions in the treaty, stipulations for which natural thought would turn to the league of nations as the indispensable instrument.

For instance, in the delimitation of the new frontier line between Belgium and Germany, it is not the league of nations, but a commission of seven persons, five of whom will be appointed by the principal allied and associated powers, who will assume this task. Equally, in connection with the renunciation of the privileges conferred upon Germany with relation to the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, it is not the league of nations who will procure for the Grand Duchy the most-favored-nation treatment which Germany provides for others, but the principal allied and associated powers.

In matters of controversy relating to the return of Alsace-Lorraine to French possession, it is not the league of nations which functions, but the Central Rhine commission—an organization set up years ago under the old order, and now made use of in the light of a new day.

In the establishment of the new Czecho-Slovak State, which was made the subject of special comment in our chief negotiator's report of his doings at Paris, it is not the league of nations which will determine its frontiers—even though it later must guarantee them—but it is the principal allied and associated powers, who, through a commission of seven members, five to be named by them, will trace the frontier line between Poland and Czechoslovakia; and in the proceedings necessary to protect the rights of the racial, linguistic, and religious minorities in Czechoslovakia, it is not to the league of nations that these oppressed people turn, but to the principal allied and associated powers.

Similarly with Poland, Mr. President. Where boundaries for the new Poland are not definitely laid down in the treaty, it is not the league of nations that will determine them, but the principal allied and associated powers, and a plebiscite there to be taken in respect of Upper Silesia is to be carried on not under the benign ægis of the league of nations but by a

régime set up by four of the principal allied and associated powers; and it is to take place in a region which the troops of those powers will occupy. Moreover, Mr. President, in Upper Silesia this commission exercises full powers of sovereignty, without reference to the league of nations, for a period, which may extend as long as 18 months, or even for an indefinite period, after the proposed plebiscite has been had; and it is not to the league of nations that the result of the vote will be communicated, but to the principal allied and associated powers, who also shall delimit the frontier and fix the time when the indigenous peoples shall take over the government of their own nation.

And for the protection of the racial, linguistic, and religious minorities in Poland, it is not the league of nations which will interpose the strong arm of defense, but the treaty which Poland agrees to make with the principal allied and associated powers.

So, too, with East Prussia. On the withdrawal of German troops and authorities from that area a commission of five members appointed by the principal allied and associated powers, with no reference to the league of nations, shall move in and take possession; they shall conduct plebiscites which they shall report not to the league of nations but to the principal allied and associated powers; and these powers will fix the frontier and determine what portion of the deficit in the budget shall be paid by the inhabitants of East Prussia.

Like provisions for the Kreise of Stuhm and Rosenberg are also contained in the treaty. Here it is not the league of nations but the principal allied and associated powers which will take possession of the territory, and what is even more significant shall, if occasion arises, be supplied with necessary military force. It is they and not the league of nations who will conduct a plebiscite, make return, and will give ultimate title to the area and perform all necessary intermediate functions.

The stipulations with regard to the territory of Memel are even more simple; for it is not in favor of the league of nations that Germany renounces all rights and titles to this area, or even to a commission, but to the principal allied and associated powers direct. Mr. President, if the treaty is ratified the United States of America will become possessed in fee simple of one undivided fifth part of the territory named, and then these powers will have full power to effect a settlement, particularly in so far as concerns the nationality of the inhabitants, which settlement Germany is bound to accept.

The free city of Danzig, the creation of which we have been assured could not have been brought about except through the indispensable instrumentality of the league of nations, constitutes an interesting subject in the stipulations of the treaty; and the significant language in the opening sentence of article 100 is that Germany renounces its rights and titles over Danzig and necessary environs area, not to the league of nations, but in favor of the principal allied and associated powers, who are to appoint a commission to delimit the frontier and to establish Danzig as a free city and then place it under the league of nations, whose only function will be to appoint a high commissioner for the free city; while it is the principal allied and associated powers who will negotiate the treaty with the Polish Government by which the latter shall "accept exceptional obligations with regard to the use of its port," and shall take over the conduct of the free city's foreign relations and the diplomatic protection of its citizens when abroad. And all property of the German Empire within the free city of Danzig passes, not to the league of nations under whose protection the free city stands, but to the principal allied and associated powers, who shall have complete liberty to distribute this property to the free city or to the Polish State as they may see fit.

So, too, with the redistribution of sovereignty over Schleswig. It is not the league of nations who will occupy the ancient duchy when German troops and the soviet councils have been withdrawn or dissolved, but a commission named by the principal allied and associated powers; and it is this commission which will conduct the inevitable plebiscite, reporting, not to the league of nations, but to the principal allied and associated powers. And it is these powers which shall delimit the frontier; it is to them that Germany definitely renounces her rights of sovereignty; and it is they who hand over to the Kingdom of Denmark the portion of Schleswig assigned to it.

The limitation of armaments has been presented to us, Mr. President, as one of the fundamental purposes of the league of nations, and it is natural to suppose that such limitation as the treaty provides in this respect would be confided to the wise heads and the active hands of the league. Yet, nowhere in the instrument does this appear to be the fact. Throughout the whole line of minutely detailed stipulations which reduce Germany to military impotence it is not the soothing agency of the

league of nations which essays the task, but the strong arm of the principal allied and associated powers.

We have been told, Mr. President, that the negotiators at Paris studied how best to put ill-governed colonies into the hands of governments which are to act as trustees for the people and not as their masters, and that there was to be some common authority among the nations made responsible in the execution of this trust. This common authority can refer to none other than our old friend the league of nations; and yet in that portion of the treaty which deals with the German colonies, the initial declaration is that Germany renounces in favor of the principal allied and associated powers and not to the league of nations all her rights and titles over her overseas possessions.

The President has spoken to us of the Turkish Empire, which he discloses as having fallen apart, and his plain implication was that here again the league of nations would be an indispensable instrumentality; yet the treaty provides that so far as Germano-Turkish relations are concerned, the sums in gold and silver had or supposed to be had in German possession with reference to the Ottoman debt and other Turkish fiscal transactions are to be paid not into the honest hands of the league of nations as trustees, but to the principal allied and associated powers. In like manner sums in gold held as pledge or as collateral in connection with German loans to the Austrian-Hungary Government, the benefits disclosed by the treaties of Bucharest and the Brest-Litovsk, and all monetary instruments, specie, securities, negotiable instruments or goods received under these treaties, pass into the possession of the principal allied and associated powers, and are to be disposed of in a manner which those powers shall hereafter determine.

I shall not dwell upon the shameful episode of Shantung, Mr. President, pausing only to say that it is not to the league of nations but to Japan that Germany renounces her rights, title, and privileges under the provision of the treaty.

The provisions for rendering Germany harmless in a military sense occupy many pages of the treaty, Mr. President; and, as I have said before, it would be natural to suppose that the league of nations would be the indispensable instrumentality for bringing this about—particularly since it is only with reference to Germany that any steps have been taken toward that delimitation of armament which is to be found, I assume, not in the immediate present, but somewhere beyond the spotlight which now shines on the pathway ahead. But, here again the word of promise is broken to the ear and hope alike; for it is a conference of military experts of the principal allied and associated powers, and not the league of nations, which will fix the reductions to be made in the number of German effectives, and it is to the principal allied and associated powers that Germany will report as to the limited stocks of munitions and guns, the armament, and the few fortified works which she will be allowed to retain. It is not the league of nations but the principal allied and associated powers who will approve the location and restrict the number of factories and works wherein Germany will be permitted to manufacture arms, munitions, and war materials. It is to the principal allied and associated powers, not to the league of nations, that Germany must surrender her surplus war material; and it is these powers, and not the league of nations, who will direct the manner in which this surrender will be effected. And when, Mr. President, the German Government shall disclose, as she must, the nature and mode of manufacture of all explosives, toxic substances, or other like chemical preparations used by her in the war or prepared for the purpose of being so used, is it to the league of nations, is it to Sir Eric Drummond that these lethal formulæ shall be turned over for deposit in the massive vaults which doubtless will form part of the equipment of the league of nations palace at Geneva? By no means; it is the principal allied and associated powers who will take over and assimilate this deadly knowledge.

The diminution of German forces upon the sea is likewise deemed by the treaty of too much importance to be turned over to the league of nations, and it is the principal allied and associated powers who will fix the number of mine-sweeping vessels which Germany may maintain, to whom will be turned over German warships now interned in neutral ports, who will receive the enumerated battleships which Germany must surrender, who will select the destroyers and torpedo boats which Germany must give up, who will supervise the breaking up of German warships now under construction, who will take possession of the submarines, their salvage vessels, and docks, including the tubular dock, which Germany must hand over, who will indicate the allied ports to which the surrendered submarines must be taken, and who will supervise the breaking up of submarines under construction, the demolition of which Germany has promised. Moreover, Mr. President, it is the

principal allied and associated powers, and not the league of nations, who will fix the quantity of arms, munitions, and war materials which German warships may have on board, who will take over the surplus of all naval war material in excess of that which Germany may maintain, who will designate the areas in the Baltic Sea which Germany must sweep and keep clear of mines, who will supervise the demolition of and the removal of guns from German fortifications in the areas between the North Sea and the Baltic, and to whom Germany shall deliver all the hydrographic information which it possesses concerning the channels and waters in this area.

The indispensable instrumentality of the league of nations thus readily dispensed with on sea and land for the effective purpose of disarmament is as clearly negligible in the air, Mr. President, for it is the principal allied and associated powers and not the league of nations to whom Germany must deliver her surplus of aeronautic material, planes, dirigibles, shelters, gas plants, engines, armament, and equipment. And, Mr. President, in connection with all of these finely-developed minutia of detail for producing the military impotence of Germany, it is neither the league of nations nor any of its instrumentalities which will function, but an interallied commission appointed for the purpose by the principal allied and associated powers to whom Germany must render all facilities, to whom Germany must make its reports, and to whom Germany must turn over its surplus.

Even in the humanitarian and sentimental aims which the treaty purposes for the repatriation of prisoners of war and interned civilians, and for the protection of graves, it is not the agency of that embodiment of all humanitarianism and of sentiment, the league of nations, to whom the treaty turns, but special commissions composed of representatives of the allied and associated powers.

It will be noted, Mr. President, and it probably will be urged by the advocates of the league of nations, that these instances which I have adduced of apparent neglect of the league as an indispensable instrument in carrying out the new order which this treaty sets up, deal, after all, with considerations more or less temporary. In a limited sense this is true. However, if the league of nations is the perfect agency which it has been described to be there is no ample reason why it should not immediately begin its functions; and the failure of the negotiators at Paris to make use of it is clearly indicative of some distrust at least of its efficacy. This conclusion becomes more evident as we advance in the treaty and reach the provisions for reparation whereby the many obligations, restrictions, and penalties which are imposed upon Germany are to be carried into effect. The President himself adverted to this theme when he last spoke to us, for he enumerated, among other functions which the league of nations would assume, "the long-continued supervision of the task of reparation which Germany is to undertake to complete within the next generation" and which, he asserted, without the league "might entirely break down."

If it shall break down, Mr. President, the league of nations may be held blameless; because nowhere, in any essential particular, is the "long-continued supervision of the task of reparation" committed to the league. That duty will rest in the hands of an interallied commission to be called the reparation commission; and the terms of its establishment disclose the singular clarification of counsel which our fellow signatories at Paris held with reference to the league of nations. The provisions of the treaty in this respect, Mr. President, are unique. Delegates to this commission shall be nominated by seven nations—the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Belgium, and the Serb-Croat-Slovene State, each of whom will appoint one delegate and an assistant delegate to act in the illness or absence of his principal. Of the seven delegates thus comprising the commission on no occasion shall more than five have the right to take part in the proceedings of the commission and to record their votes. But the delegates of the United States, Great Britain, France, and Italy shall have this right on all occasions. The delegates of Belgium, Japan, and the Serb-Croat-Slovene State shall have this right when questions particularly concerning their interests are under consideration. So that the four above-named delegates with the perpetual right to vote will always constitute a majority of the seven who will comprise the commission and the United States must always take part in the proceedings.

This commission, Mr. President, has many and widespread powers. At the outset it will take over bonds of the German Government in the sum required to make reimbursement of the moneys borrowed by Belgium from its allied Governments, and shall give receipt thereof on behalf of Belgium to the exclusion of the sovereign rights of that power; and the commission is further empowered to determine the amount of compen-

sation to be afforded Belgium for the restoration of the damage done in that country by German forces during the war. And, in addition to its authority for making provisions under which Germany's total obligation of reparation shall be paid within a period of 30 years, it is empowered to extend the period of payment if its discretion shall so indicate. This commission shall fix, up to the 1st of May, 1921, the manner and the sums in which Germany shall pay the allied and associated powers the equivalent of 20,000,000,000 gold marks whether in gold, commodities, ships, securities, or otherwise; it shall lay down procedure for the return by Germany of cash taken away, seized, or sequestered, restitution of animals of every nature, and securities thus taken away or seized; and Germany agrees irrevocably to the possession and exercise by this commission of the great power and authority given to it under the terms of the present treaty.

In this day of open covenants openly arrived at, and in the new era where the light streams so brightly upon our path, it is interesting further, Mr. President, to note the absolute requirement in the treaty that all proceedings of this commission shall be private, unless for special reasons and on particular occasions the commission shall decide otherwise.

In addition, the commission shall "in general have wide liberty as to its handling and controlling of the whole restoration problem," and "shall have authority to interpret" the provisions of reparation which the treaty makes. It is recognized—shall we say in further affront to the league of nations—as "the exclusive agency" of the participating governments for "receiving, selling, holding, and distributing the reparation payments to be made by Germany" under the reparation sections of this treaty. And, in carrying out its extensive functions, it shall have authority to require Germany to cover such portions of approved claims as are not paid in gold or in the enumerated equivalents by the issue of bonds or other obligations. It is also empowered and directed to examine the German system of taxation and to satisfy itself that "in general the German scheme of taxation is fully as heavy proportionately as that of any of the powers represented on the commission."

The decisions of this commission may be rendered in two ways. On six classes of questions "unanimity is necessary," and these questions involve the sovereignty of any of the participating powers; the cancellation of the whole or any part of the German debt; the determination of the amount and conditions of German bonds; their issuance, selling, negotiation, or distribution; the postponement, total or partial, within certain limitations, of installments upon the reparation fund; and questions of the interpretation of the provisions of the treaty under which the commission shall act. In all other cases the action will be taken by majority vote, and its decision shall, without further proceedings, "forthwith become binding and be put into immediate execution." The commission further will issue to the interested powers its certification of the amount of German bonds which it holds for each of the beneficiaries; and certificates stating the amount of goods delivered on account of reparation debt and held by the commission for the account of any power; and these certifications when registered and upon notice to the commission may be transferred by indorsement, thus adding to the existing volume of bonds and other obligations of the allied governments a vast and unknown quantity of German warehouse certificates and notes of hand indorsed by powers of whom we shall be one.

I have indicated, Mr. President, that this commission runs until 1951; but it may run much longer in the event that Germany shall find herself unable to pay under the terms imposed, and, in consequence, the treaty provides that the commission shall be dismissed only "when all the amounts due from Germany and her allies under the present treaty" have been paid, or when "the decisions of the commission have been discharged and all sums received, or their equivalent, have been distributed to the powers interested." And in this connection, Mr. President, it may not be unworthy of notice that the press dispatches from Paris, thus far standing uncontradicted, say that our representative on this great commission, taking the responsibility for our participation in this prolonged and troublesome task, is Mr. Edward Dulles, who, being unknown either in business or in public life, is identified to the public mind mainly by the fact that he is a nephew or some other connection of the present Secretary of State.

This commission, Mr. President, will exercise control over the shipyards of Germany through its power to determine the amount of tonnage to be laid down for the account of reparation for shipping lost in the war. It will draw the specifications of the ships to be built, the conditions under which they are to be built and delivered, the price per ton at which they are to be

accounted for, and all other questions relating to this matter. In other words, Mr. President, this commission, constituted as I have said, will enter upon the shipbuilding business in Germany; and it is to be hoped that the mistakes made by this country when embarking upon a like enterprise will not find repetition.

This commission will also receive and distribute the animals, machinery, equipment, tools, and like articles of a commercial character, the reconstruction materials, heating apparatus, furniture, and the like, which Germany must repay in kind. The commission will determine the value to be attributed to these and will undertake to deliver them as specified. The commission may require of Germany, as part of its reparation, the delivery of dyestuffs and chemical drugs, not exceeding 50 per cent of the total stock of each which was found in Germany or under German control at the date of coming into force of the treaty; and it shall fix the price of this material.

The powers of the commission react in one particular upon States other than Germany, inasmuch as the powers to whom German territory is ceded undertake to pay a portion of the debt of the German Empire as it stood prior to the war, to be collected on a basis fixed in the treaty subject to the judgment of the restoration commission, together with the portion of the debt of each German State in which such ceded territory stood before the war, the exact amount to be determined by the commission.

I have by no means exhausted the list of powers and duties which the reparation commission will assume, but I hope that I have made it clear that this agency, deriving its authority, not from the league of nations but from the principal allied and associated powers, is in fact the indispensable instrumentality which will furnish the long-continued supervision of Germany's bitter program of atonement.

Shall we turn now, Mr. President, to another question with which this encyclopedic treaty deals—the question of adjustment of debts between the nationals of enemy powers, their property rights and interests, their contracts, prescriptions, and judgments? These are always matters of delicate adjustment upon the conclusion of any war, and exceptionally so in the case of a war as widespread as this and involving so many nations of commercial activity. These questions particularly, Mr. President, would appear to fall within the beneficent diplomatic functions of an indispensable instrument like the league of nations, but instead you will find that the treaty commits them to a mixed arbitrable tribunal set up between Germany and each of the allied and associate powers.

I make no pretense, Mr. President, to have touched, within a wide margin, the total number of particularized references which the treaty makes, respectively, to the league of nations and the signatory powers as active agencies for carrying the treaty stipulations into effect, and I have made no effort to summarize the myriad manner in which the reparation commission is to function. But even this incomplete summary is sufficient, I think, to demonstrate that the negotiators of the treaty had no respect for the league of nations as an indispensable instrument such as the President has sought to make us believe. Numerically stated, Mr. President, the number of references to these respective agencies under the treaty to which I have referred may be summarized as follows:

The principal allied and associated powers figure 76 times; the allied and associated powers figure 45 times—a total of 121. Whereas the league of nations figures altogether only 57 times, and of these, 21 refer to its nebulous connection with the administration of the Saar Valley; 18 in connection with the labor clauses of which the league is supposed to be the special champion, and only 3 to Danzig, in relation to which we have been told the league is a prime necessity, leaving only 15 references to general activity for the league of nations in the entire 253 pages which constitute the treaty apart from the covenant of the league itself.

These figures, Mr. President, should be sufficient not only to refute the claim that the league of nations is an indispensable instrumentality in carrying out the provisions of this treaty; but they also serve as an effective denial of the defiant claim made in New York on the 4th of March, 1919, that the league of nations "if we could but form it, would be an invaluable instrument through which to secure the operation of the various parts of the treaty; and that when the treaty comes back, gentlemen on this side would find the covenant not only in it but so many threads of the treaty tied to the covenant that you can not dissect the covenant from the treaty without destroying the whole vital structure." It will be neither a delicate nor a difficult task of dissection, Mr. President, to remove from the treaty the 15 general provisions which it contains in regard to the league of nations; and I assume that France will be able to

assimilate the Saar Valley and that an international council of labor can be set up even if the league of nations shall never come into being.

I hope, moreover, Mr. President, that an examination of the treaty will convince others, as it has convinced me, that the instrument is infinitely worse for us than even the league of nations, bad as it is; for whatever may be said of the baleful consequences which will flow to the United States from the operation of the league of nations, they are, after all, in futuro; whereas the provisions of this treaty immediately and without recourse thrust us automatically and by authority into the endless snarls of attempting to set new boundaries for contentious races in Europe and impose upon us a share in the task of holding Germany in leash, of stifling her commercial and industrial development, and even of framing and applying the most essential of her internal statutes. Once drawn into these meshes of international complications, Mr. President, it will be difficult for us to extricate ourselves, and I would have the Senate and the country realize fully, before we set our seal of approval upon this instrument, that it means a complete departure from all the traditions and principles which have governed us from the foundation of the Republic; that it means our entrance into and our active participation in all of the numberless broils which now exist in troubled Europe and which the next few years will multiply; and I hope, Mr. President, that before any such irremediable course is decided upon both the Senate and the country will study carefully this treaty in all its bearings.

In this connection, Mr. President, it is worth noting that this is only the first of four similar instruments. The treaties with Austria-Hungary, our only remaining enemy; with Bulgaria, and with Turkey, against whom we have never declared war, but to which we shall be signatories, are yet to come. When we contemplate the number of entanglements presented by the present treaty I shudder to think of that which will be disclosed when we attempt to make ourselves party to the controversy over the remaining portions of Czechoslovakia; to the disposition of the Banat; to the tracing of the lines for Italia irredenta, Albania, Epirus, Greece, Bulgaria, Roumania, the Serb-Croat-Slovene State, Thrace, Bessarabia, Asia Minor, and the middle East.

Disraeli, returning from the Congress of Berlin, summed up his labors there in the laconic phrase, "Peace with honor." Yet neither peace nor honor flowed from the treaty of Berlin, certain conditions of which—unenforced and unenforceable—contained and disseminated the germ of the present war. It is to be hoped that none of the phrase makers of to-day will be permitted to repeat Disraeli's fatal error of word and deed; and it lies in our hands, Senators, to make sure that this shall not be done. This treaty of Versailles is as menacing to the peace of the world to-day as the treaty of Berlin was 40 years ago, and unless we can make in it changes which I deem primarily essential I shall not vote for its ratification.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question, if he would not object. Is it not true that the reparation commission, in addition to the powers the Senator has enumerated, has the power to commit acts of war which Germany agrees not to regard as acts of war, such as the taking of territory?

Mr. MOSES. Without question, Mr. President, the reparation commission has the power to commit acts of warlike aggression which but for the exceptional terms of this treaty would be regarded as acts of war.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. BECKHAM obtained the floor.

Mr. GRONNA. With the consent of the Senator from Kentucky, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report.

Mr. BECKHAM. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GRONNA. I am directed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to report back favorably with an amendment the bill (H. R. 7413) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

I had hoped, Mr. President, on account of the pressing necessity of securing funds for the Agricultural Department, to have this bill passed to-day. I find, however, that the day has been set aside for the important purpose of discussing the peace treaty and the league of nations; and several Senators have also requested that the bill be printed. Therefore I shall content myself by asking that the bill be printed, and I give notice that to-morrow, at the earliest opportunity, I shall ask to have the bill taken up for discussion and final disposition.

Mr. President, if I may say another word, I request, if possible, that the bill may be taken up to-morrow, because it is highly important that it should be speedily disposed of. I am sure that almost all Senators here know that in the western sec-

tion of the country forest fires are raging and the Agricultural Department is without funds with which to quench them. Something ought to be done speedily to give the much-needed relief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

PEACE TREATY AND LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. BECKHAM. Mr. President, in the comparatively brief time which I shall occupy upon this subject it is not my purpose to enter into a full discussion of the details of the treaty or the covenant of the league of nations, but to confine my remarks principally to some general observations upon the whole subject. I am going to ask, in doing so, what other Senators have done on similar occasions, that in pursuing my line of argument I may be excused from any interruptions.

Mr. President, in approaching the discussion of the league of nations at this stage of its consideration one must realize that practically everything has been said about it, either for it or against it, that could be said, and in speaking upon it I can not indulge the hope of throwing any new light upon the subject or of producing any fact or argument that might change the opinion of anyone.

For many months it has absorbed the attention and the consideration of the people of the civilized world as the most important and far-reaching problem affecting the peace and welfare of every nation. Upon its proper disposition and settlement may depend, not only our own prosperity and happiness, but the prosperity and happiness of generations yet unborn. I do not exaggerate, I am sure, the situation when I say that it marks a most critical and fateful epoch in the world's history. It invites and it deserves the best thought and the profoundest consideration that our people can give any subject. We stand upon the threshold of a new era so big with its possibilities and its problems that we may well hesitate, take our bearings, study our course, and appeal to divine guidance that we may not make a false step.

The American Senate has upon it in the consideration of this matter a solemn and tremendous responsibility; and never before has its judgment and intellect been summoned to the consideration of a greater problem. As we pause in our national pilgrimage at this fork of the road, anxious to know which way we should proceed, duly alarmed at the grave consequences of a mistaken decision, and greatly confused by the clamor of conflicting advice, it is but natural that we, the Members of this body, now called upon to ratify the treaty, should exercise the highest degree of caution and prudence in making a choice so fraught with results of good or ill, not only to the people of our own Nation, but to the people of the rest of the world.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I have not been one of those who have been disposed to criticize or rebuke those who take a different view from mine on this question. If there ever was a time when a subject deserved the utmost liberality of thought and breadth of view in its discussion upon the part of those who differ in their opinions, that time is now. Political predilections or personal prejudices should not for a moment enter into the mind of any Senator in dealing with a subject like this. It is one that transcends all partisan or personal issues, and one which should receive the fairest and most impartial consideration that the mind of man can give. Woe unto that party or that person who would seek to bring it down to the level of a partisan or political issue. The temper of the American people will not tolerate such a degradation, and would be swift to visit upon the offender a just and proper rebuke.

While I have my views upon this question and intend to support the treaty, including the covenant for the league of nations, for reasons which it is my purpose in part to discuss, I have never for a moment in my mind doubted the sincerity and patriotism of those distinguished Senators who have different views from mine and who have on numerous occasions so ably and eloquently expressed their opposition to it. I recognize that they are just as good Americans as any of us. They are inspired, I am sure, by the same spirit of devotion to our country's welfare as any of us who advocate this league can claim. Beyond doubt they honestly believe in the apparent perils which their imaginations have conjured and their eloquence has so graphically pictured as the results to follow the adoption of such a league.

Neither, Mr. President, have I been inclined to believe that partisanship has exercised its malign influence in determining the attitude of Senators on this matter, either for it or against it, despite the color given to such a charge by the ill-starred and untimely "round robin" at the close of the last session of Congress presented only to Republican Senators and signed only by members of that party. In the hurry and confusion of the closing hours of the session it can be well understood that its

import and significance did not receive that thoughtful consideration upon the part of the signers as it deserved, and such as they would ordinarily give to any matter of importance. That celebrated document served no good purpose and had no effect other than it might have further embarrassed our representatives at Paris in the peace conference in the very difficult work in which they were engaged.

I can not believe that those in the Senate or out of it who will control and direct the policies of the Republican Party will commit the very serious mistake of undertaking to make this question or any feature of it a party issue. It is not the part of one upon this side of the Chamber to give advice to them upon any matter of party expediency, but I believe that I may take the liberty of delivering a warning to them, that if they go before the American people in the presidential and congressional elections next year with their hands bloodied with the mutilation or defeat of this league of nations, then their party and its candidates will meet at the polls the most ignominious and overwhelming defeat in all of its history. Those leaders of that party who are flushed with abundant hope in the light of the congressional elections of last fall and think the Republican Party is marching on to a victorious triumph in the campaign and election in 1920 would do well, before they cast the fortunes of their party against this league, to study and take account of the mind of the American people on this subject.

As I have indicated before, I earnestly hope that this question will be kept above the level of an issue in partisan politics; but if it is made such an issue it will be made so by the leaders of the Republican Party and not by the Democratic Party. And if it should become such an issue it will, I firmly believe, rebound beyond doubt to the advantage and success of the Democratic Party.

Why do I say this, Mr. President? It is because of my confident belief that the common sense of a vast majority of the American people see in the adoption and operation of this league of nations the best guaranty of the future peace of the world and the surest protection against wars it is possible for men to devise. That common sense which has nearly always directed the American people in times of great crises is a safer and more reliable guide for governmental action than the most learned and profound arguments of statesmen. Able and eminent Senators may make the most skillful and powerful arguments upon this floor or elsewhere against the league, calling attention to what they consider its imperfections or its technical defects, and no matter how sincere and eloquent they may be, their arguments must at last stand the test of this common sense, which in the end will determine the fate of this treaty, and whether or not our country shall become a member of the proposed league of nations.

I have listened carefully to some of the able addresses delivered by opponents of the league on this floor, and I have been in sympathy to some extent with the spirit which animated the Senators who delivered them. I have fully appreciated their strong sentiment of Americanism, their devotion to the teachings of the fathers of the Republic, and their aversion to any variance from the traditional foreign policies of our Government; and I for one would never censure them for their opposition to this measure, if they believe that its adoption would mean that our country would thereby sacrifice and abandon any of those great principles upon which it has grown and prospered to such a marvelous degree of power and strength. I confess that I am loath that we should take any step that might embroil our people needlessly in the quarrels and strifes of European countries or of any other countries.

When they speak of American isolation from foreign complications I wish with all of the fervor of my heart that we might possess that desired isolation, which, after all, is only a vain dream of their patriotic imagination. What an admirable situation it would be, Mr. President, and how stoutly should we maintain it, if it were true that we could look upon a European conflict with a spirit of benign indifference, and with no obligation upon our part to take a hand in it, except so far as we might see fit in a spirit of humanity and justice to interpose our good offices and our disinterested purposes to bring about peace and conciliation in those war-stricken lands. How much better it would be for us as a Nation on such occasions, if we need only to aid them by precept rather than by participation, and if we could only by our good example of governmental excellence show them how they, too, should live, rather than be compelled to send our armies and our Navy over there and by force teach them that they must not only keep peace among themselves, but that they must refrain from trespassing upon the inherent rights and privileges of American citizens.

But, alas, Mr. President, that boasted and unattainable isolation for us does not exist and never has existed since this

Republic began its career. It exists less now than it did in the beginning. In each general European war since the beginning of our Government the wisest of our statesmen and the most peaceful of our administrators have been unable to keep us out, notwithstanding the supposed security of isolation.

In the wars following the French Revolution it required the supreme wisdom and patriotism of Washington and his advisers to keep this country out of direct participation in those conflicts. In the Napoleonic Wars, during the administrations of Jefferson and Madison, the statesmanship of those great Presidents was taxed to the utmost in their efforts to guide our Nation from the tempestuous seas of those struggles, and even then the provocations became so unbearable and humiliating that the peace-loving Madison could no longer hold back the inevitable issue, and in 1812 we became involved in that conflict in our war with England.

Those were days, too, when there seemed to be some reason, at least geographical reason, to rely upon the apparent advantage of isolation. An ocean 3,000 miles wide separated us, and at that time no steam-propelled ship had ever crossed its stormy paths; no cables nor wireless had flashed across it their instantaneous messages.

How different is the situation now, and to how little does that wide expanse of water amount! The broad ocean, by reason of the remarkable progress of science and invention, is little more than a narrow river separating the continents. Steam, electricity, and the wonders of modern science have annihilated those great distances, and, politically speaking, our Nation, its people, and its business are practically contiguous in their relations to the people of Europe. We may not like it, but we can not help it.

If we could not avoid a part in European conflicts of more than a century ago, how much less reason is there for us to hope to avoid it in these days under such vastly changed conditions? President Madison in the years preceding 1812 did not strive more earnestly and patriotically to keep this country out of that war than did President Wilson in the years preceding 1917 strive to keep it out of the awful European conflict which was so recently brought to a successful conclusion. We can all well see now how inevitable was our participation in that struggle from the time that Germany, in 1914, marched her murderous hordes through Belgium and northern France.

For nearly three years, with admirable patience and the wisest statecraft, our President bore with the provocations which challenged us to the conflict and endeavored to avail our country of the supposed advantage of isolation. So great were those provocations and insults, and so patient and earnest was our administration in its efforts to save us from the tremendous sacrifices of war, that there were many who charged it with cowardice and pacifism. At last the irresistible tide, against which the hand of no man nor set of men could stand, carried us into it, and with what results I need not now relate.

One of the lessons which we should learn as a result of this war, if we did not know it before, however unpleasant it may be to us, is that we need not ever again talk of isolation as an element in national safety. It is, therefore, surprising, Mr. President, that men of such distinguished ability as some of those who oppose this league should undertake to argue now on that line and seek to solace us with the shattered delusion that we can maintain isolation or separation from European quarrels, however odious and abominable they may seem to us.

In June, 1914, the shot fired from the pistol in the hand of a fanatical assassin at the Archduke Ferdinand at Sarajevo, a town so remote from us that scarcely any Americans had ever heard of it, lighted the fire which set the whole world in bloody conflagration and sent to their death tens of thousands of American boys upon foreign battle fields. How then can we hope for immunity or protection from those troubles in the future? If geographical distances and political ideals have not protected us in the past, how can we expect them to do so in the years to come? Let us banish forever that idle dream, however soothing it may have been to our sense of national security.

The American people, Mr. President, know these things, and it is their unflinching common sense which will set at naught the adroit and eloquent arguments of the opponents of the league. That common sense teaches them to ask these questions of the opponents: "Let us admit that there is some force in your criticism of various sections of the league, do you not think it is, on the whole, worth while trying? All other methods have failed in the past to keep the peace of the world. Triple alliances, entente cordiales, balances of power have all failed and broken down, and is it not well for us to try another plan, one which comes to us with the indorsement of the leading statesmen of all the nations who took part in the peace conference at Paris? Your arguments are plausible. We share that spirit

of Americanism which pervades them, but where do they lead us? You propose no other remedy. Your criticism is destructive and not constructive. Without this league of nations what have we as a protection against future wars? If your position is correct and the league should be abandoned, then you would put us back to the statu quo ante bellum. That would be intolerable, and we would never agree to such a determination. We would infinitely rather take this league as it is, admitting the imperfections which you describe, than to go back to the international chaos that made possible the horrible tragedy which bereaved the whole world, sent to slaughter nearly 8,000,000 of the strong and brave young men of the world, and left in its wake a train of sorrow and desolation never before equaled in all history."

That, Mr. President, seems to me to be the way in which the great common people of the country are looking at this question. They have seen with remarkable quickness and precision that flaw in the argument of the opposition which suggests no substitute, which proposes no plan, which offers no remedy to protect us in any way whatever from the hideous monster of war. They are not deluded with the hope that this league will be an absolutely certain and sure preventive of future wars. They realize that no instrument of this kind can be at once framed and promulgated without imperfections or defects; but they do believe that it is infinitely better than any plan hitherto followed by the nations of the earth, and that it does offer the best hope that we can find to secure peace in the future.

They are willing to try it, Mr. President. The great majority of our people, beyond any doubt in my mind, favor its trial. Their fears have not been excited to any great degree by the gloomy pictures in the arguments of the opponents of the league. They are unwilling to believe that in article 10, or in some of the other sections which have been so severely inveighed against, there are hidden instruments of mischief that may at some time in the future be used to our great injury and loss. They have read that much-abused article 10, which says:

The high contracting parties undertake to respect and preserve, as against external aggression, the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all States members of the league. In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the executive council shall advise upon the means by which the obligation shall be fulfilled.

The common-sense citizen in reading that article does not see in it the many snares and mares' nests and evil demons which have possessed and inflamed the lurid imaginations of some orators, who have attempted to describe it as a veritable Pandora's box of trouble and danger. His common sense quickly answers these prophets of disaster with the unalterable conviction that if article 10 had existed as a part of international law in the early summer of 1914 and had been recognized as an obligation upon the part of those nations which were afterwards engaged in the war with Germany, as they now propose to recognize and enforce it, then that war would never have occurred and its untold and incalculable sacrifices would never have had to be made. Instead of article 10 being an invitation to war, as some have described it, it will become the greatest insurance we can possibly secure against war in the future.

Let us compare, Mr. President, section 5 of the Knox resolution with this article 10 in the covenant. The Senator from Pennsylvania, who introduced that resolution, is one of the ablest and strongest opponents of the proposed league and has delivered in the Senate several speeches against it which received the most respectful and earnest attention. It is true that section 5 was stricken out of the resolution by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and it is understood that it was stricken out in order to secure enough votes to pass the other sections of the resolution. Section 5 reads as follows:

That, finally, it shall be the declared policy of our Government, in order to meet fully and fairly our obligations to ourselves and to the world, that the freedom and peace of Europe being again threatened by any power or combination of powers, the United States will regard such a situation with grave concern as a menace to its own peace and freedom, will consult with other powers affected with a view to devising means for the removal of such menace, and will, the necessity arising in the future, carry out the same complete accord and cooperation with our chief cobelligerents for the defense of civilization.

Does article 10 go any further than that in principle? Does it obligate us any more to go to war than we would be obligated if section 5 of the Knox resolution was substituted in its place? Practically the only difference that I see between the two is that article 10 as a part of the league of nations will have all the machinery ready for operation when the danger or menace may arise, and section 5 of the Knox resolution does not contemplate such machinery, and before it could be provided war would be on, and the purpose of it would be defeated so far as the prevention of war might be concerned. It is true that article 10 seems to place upon us a more direct obligation, but that obligation of action on our part

would not arise unless by a unanimous vote of the executive council in which this country would have its vote. Nor could article 10 operate to limit or annul the provision in our Federal Constitution which gives Congress alone the right to declare war and to provide money and means to carry on war. We therefore do not need any reservation upon that article, because we have under the league the protection contained in the requirement of a unanimous vote and the reservation which our Constitution provides as to the power of Congress to declare war.

I believe, Mr. President, that our constitutional provision alone is ample protection to us in that respect; for if at any time the executive council by unwise or unjust action should seek to involve us in a difficulty to which we should not properly be a party Congress could in such a case, without incurring a just charge of violation of our obligations under the treaty, use its discretion before declaring war or supplying the means with which to conduct it.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], in a very able and exhaustive address delivered in the Senate one day last month in favor of the league of nations, called particular attention to this section 5 in the Knox resolution. After quoting that section, the Senator said:

Mr. President, I would be satisfied if that section 5, without elimination or addition, should be the only compact between the great nations of the world. All I would ask would be that it be signed by the other members of the league of nations as their concurrent policy. That would, in my opinion, prevent unjust wars as effectively as the 26 articles of the proposed national league.

What the distinguished Senator says deserves the most earnest consideration, for he has given to this subject the deepest thought and the most careful treatment. No partisan bias, no personal prejudices have entered into his mind in urging a decision upon so momentous a subject, and he stands conspicuously upon his side of the Chamber as a champion of the principles of the league of nations, which for many years past have been advocated by distinguished leaders in both of the great political parties in this country.

Mr. President, this idea of a league of nations is not new, for it has been advocated for many years by distinguished leaders of thought, not only in this country but in other civilized countries. Even before the European war started, in August, 1914, the plan had begun to attract the attention of many men in every country, and numerous societies were organized to work for the cause of international peace and the adoption of some league of nations which would, as far as possible, guarantee the peace of the world. Unfortunately, when the matter reached the stage where President Wilson found the opportunity to aid in embodying in a definite and practical form this principle, many who in the past had favored the idea began to change their position and to find fault with the plan adopted by the peace conference in Paris. I shall not undertake to quote from the addresses and writings of those who once favored a league of nations, but who now pick flaws in the proposed league and withhold their support from it. We shall let that pass. I shall refer only to the position of two eminent Americans who have held the highest office within the gift of our people.

Former President Taft has been for many years, and is now, one of the ablest and most enthusiastic supporters of a league of nations. He has advocated this proposed league in a way that has won the admiration of most of his fellow countrymen. No President of our country, after he had gone out of that high office, has gained more in the hearts of his countrymen by his conduct and his service than Mr. Taft has done. There are many who believe that he is stronger to-day before the people than he has ever been, and while it might not be altogether to the taste and liking of some of the Republican leaders, it is not by any means unlikely that he may win the presidential nomination of his party next year. Those of our Republican friends who are not particularly fond of him and who would object strenuously to seeing him nominated for the Presidency, had well take warning in the rapidly growing strength of this eminent American.

Another distinguished leader of that party, the late Col. Roosevelt, was also an ardent advocate of a league of nations, and I am going to take the liberty of quoting two utterances of his on that subject, which should remove all doubt about his position. These two utterances were repeated in the able address delivered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] some time ago in the Senate, but they are so much to the point that I believe it well to call attention to them again.

When he accepted the Nobel peace prize at Christiania, in 1910, he said in part:

It would be a master stroke if those great powers honestly bent on peace would form a league of peace, not only to keep the peace among themselves, but to prevent, by force if necessary, its being broken by

others. The supreme difficulty in connection with developing the peace work of The Hague arises from the lack of any executive power, of any police power, to enforce the decrees of the courts.

Again, in a letter from him to the New York Times, October 18, 1914, he expressed his views on the subject:

The one permanent move for obtaining peace which has yet been suggested, with any reasonable chance of obtaining its object, is by an agreement among the great powers, in which each should pledge itself not only to abide by the decision of the common tribunal, but to back with force the decision of that common tribunal. The great civilized nations of the world which do possess force, actual or immediately potential, should combine by solemn agreement in a great world league for the peace of righteousness.

They should, furthermore, not only agree to abide, each of them, by the decision of the court, but all of them to unite with their military forces to enforce the decree of the court as against any recalcitrant member. Under these circumstances it would be possible to agree on a limitation of armaments that would be real and effective.

I understand, Mr. President, that some of his close personal and political friends have stated that if Col. Roosevelt were living to-day he would be vigorously opposed to this league. In the light of what he said on the two occasions to which I have referred, it seems to me that these friends do an injustice to his memory when they say that he, if living, would repudiate the ideas and principles which he so well expressed on those occasions. Those ideas have been embodied in a practical form in this league, and I am unwilling to believe that the distinguished former President, if he were living to-day, would take such a position as some of his friends say he would.

I wish that it might be, Mr. President, when the time comes to pass upon this treaty in the Senate and the roll is called, when each Senator shall register his vote upon the record of this body, that no one inside or outside of this Chamber shall ever be able to point to the vote of a single Senator and have reason to say that his judgment upon this grave subject was influenced by prejudice, dwarfed by partisan bias, or misled by some lurking ill will toward the person of the distinguished President of the United States whose guiding genius had so much to do with the framing and character of this historic document. I know that the best of us are not always free from such influences, operating frequently in an unconscious way upon us in our deliberations upon many matters that come before us.

But surely, Mr. President, if there ever was a time that time is now, if there ever was a question that question is this, when each Senator should divest himself of every prejudice of any kind and rise to the plane of that broad Americanism and statesmanship, look at this great subject with unclouded vision, and with a heart and mind so free that only the real merit of the document will be considered and not the personality of anyone responsible for its production. Let us remember that it is the measure and not the man that we are considering. Let us be constantly reminded that we are dealing with a question of world-wide importance, a question touching the peace and welfare not only of our country but of the other nations of the earth, and let us not descend into the mire to play a miserable and disgraceful game for political advantage or personal pique.

It has developed, Mr. President, recently that the opponents of the league have seized upon the disposition of the Shantung Peninsula by the treaty as one of their strongest points of objection to the ratification of the treaty. We have heard it discussed lately a number of times upon the floor of the Senate and elsewhere in the country. Opponents of the league have directed some of their heaviest fire at this provision, and in some instances it has been given as a reason to justify the defeat of the treaty.

This, it seems to me, is one of the shallowest arguments yet advanced by the opposition. It is one, however, that appeals to sentiment and to the imagination, and the opponents of the league have not failed to play upon that feature of it and to exaggerate its importance in relation to the multitude of far more vital problems which this treaty undertakes to settle.

The Shantung Peninsula, with its ports, as we all know, was in the possession of Germany, and had been since 1898, when Germany seized it by force from China. That seizure was wrong, as all admit, but it was acquiesced in by the other nations of the world. It is not for us at this time to enter into a discussion of that wrong. In the latter part of 1914, after Japan had entered the World War against Germany, she acquired this Province by force of arms from Germany and has held it since then. She has announced solemnly on several occasions that it is her purpose to restore the Province to China and has pledged her faith and honor as a nation to do so. I am one of those who believe that she will keep her promise, not only as an act of national good faith, but also in view of the fact that with so much attention drawn to this question her honor as a nation would be forever so tarnished in the eyes of the world if she failed to do so that she would suffer irreparable injury. It is, I believe, unfair, as it is certainly

indiscreet, for Senators upon this floor to attack her good faith before she has broken it or has been given sufficient opportunity to fulfill her promise and obligation.

But it is not my purpose, Mr. President, to discuss all of the features of this question. I have referred to it and briefly recited some of the facts in regard to it in order to call particular attention to one view of the subject which I have not yet heard discussed upon the floor, but which it seems to me is one that deserves the most serious consideration in justice to Japan's position. Senators have criticized the peace conference, and particularly our representatives there, in not demanding that Japan should surrender that Province immediately and in not having put in this treaty a provision compelling her to do so. Have Senators thought what this meant to Japan, whose people are so sensitive, and who already felt aggrieved at the refusal of the conference to place in the treaty some provision on the race question?

Japan met her allies in that conference as an equal, as one who had taken part in the war with them, and as one of the five great powers which practically dictated and controlled the terms of peace. She had acquired territory from Germany by conquest; so had England; so had France; and Italy had acquired territory from Austria. Was there a reason why Japan alone of all the Allies should be singled out and compelled by the terms of peace to surrender immediately territory which she had acquired when her other allies were not asked to be subjected to such treaty stipulation? In effect, Mr. President, such an insistence by the other allies upon Japan to surrender Shantung Province by a provision in the treaty of peace would have meant this: "We, the representatives of the allied and associated Governments in this peace conference, although you have been one of our allies in the prosecution of the war, do not trust you; and notwithstanding that you have given your solemn word that it is your purpose in due time to surrender this Province to China, we demand that it be now stipulated in this treaty and definitely fixed as to terms and time."

If such had been done, Mr. President, it would have been the only case of the kind in this treaty. I for one do not believe that Japan, even if it might have been her intention and wish to surrender that Province to China the next day, could have agreed to such a provision without a sacrifice of her self-respect and an aspersion being cast upon her national honor. That was one of the most difficult problems before the peace conference, and one which, I believe, they treated in the only way possible for the present. We must in this case rely upon the future for its proper and honorable settlement.

The position of Japan on this question is well illustrated in a statement given out by Baron Makino, one of the Japanese peace delegates at Paris, on April 30, 1919, in which he said:

We are accused of intending to occupy Kiaochow permanently. That is inexact. We have agreed to restore it to China. Our agreements will hold—our agreements always hold. There is no example in history of Japan breaking her word. It is just because nobody has the right to doubt our honor that we ourselves should be allowed to arrange restitution and not be compelled in a way that would indicate unjust suspicion.

From now on international law and justice will stand upon a higher plane than ever before, especially if this league of nations is adopted. Many serious and grave issues which in the past were settled only by armed conflicts will be settled hereafter by a sense of fair dealing and right. A nation guilty of dishonor or of a broken promise will not be able in the future to stand before the rest of the world in the glare of its just condemnation. It is impossible that this treaty, the most comprehensive in all of the history of the world, should not have in it here and there some article or adjustment which does not square with the strict principles of equity and justice. No one can claim that it is perfect. But anyone makes a serious mistake if he seizes upon some imperfection in it as a reason to defeat the whole treaty. I think that under all of the circumstances the peace conference did the best it could in regard to the Shantung issue, and I can not believe that even if a mistake was made it is sufficient to justify a single vote against the ratification of the treaty. Let Japan be given the opportunity to make good her promise to right the wrong, originally committed by Germany, before we undertake this severe and improper criticism of her.

Mr. President, it has occasionally been observed since this discussion began some months ago that there was much in the opposition to the league of nations to recall to us the opposition to our Federal Constitution after it was adopted by the convention in 1787 and before its ratification by all of the States. I have myself from the beginning been greatly impressed by this parallel between the two events, and I have been frequently reminded by the arguments used against this league of how

similar in character and often in presentation are they to the arguments used in some of the State conventions that were held to ratify the Federal Constitution.

The adoption of that instrument was the greatest experiment in government ever tried by man. It is easy for us now, with our long perspective view, to see how futile, if not foolish, were some of the arguments used against its adoption. We naturally wonder that some of the eminent statesmen of that time could have offered such objections to it or could have hesitated to give it their enthusiastic approval. And yet I believe, Mr. President, that those men, many of them of great distinction and ability, had as much reason to fear disastrous results from the adoption of that Constitution as to-day the opponents of the league of nations have to fear from the adoption of this covenant.

Let us endeavor to carry ourselves back to that period in our history, unenlightened by any of the events subsequent to the adoption of the Constitution. Let us try to look into the future from that time as our forefathers did, and we can better appreciate the difficulties that confronted them. They realized what an experiment it would be. They dreaded lest the young country, with its thirteen independent States, might embark upon a sea of greater danger and peril than they had escaped from in severing their relations with the mother country.

Even Thomas Jefferson, whose political wisdom and foresight have never been excelled by any man in his or any other generation, said in a letter to John Adams of November 13, 1787, after the Philadelphia convention had framed the Constitution and submitted it to the States:

How do you like our new Constitution? I confess that there are things in it which stagger all my disposition to subscribe to what such an assembly has proposed. The House of Federal Representatives will not be adequate to the management of affairs, either foreign or Federal. Their President seems to be a bad edition of a Polish king. He may be elected from four years to four years for life. * * *

And he goes on, calling attention to other objections to the document. In another letter to a friend, dated December 31, 1787, he said:

As to the new Constitution, I find myself nearly a neutral. There is a great mass of good in it, in a very desirable form, but there is also, to me, a bitter pill or two. I have written somewhat lengthily to Mr. Madison upon this subject, and will take the liberty to refer you to that part of my letter to him.

Does not that, Mr. President, illustrate the position of many of the opponents of the league of nations?

But as time went on Mr. Jefferson began to change his attitude toward the Constitution and became one of the advocates of its adoption. On May 17, 1788, in a letter to a friend—and I commend this, Mr. President, most earnestly to the consideration of those who hesitate about changing a position when once taken and invite their attention to the intellectual operation of one of our country's greatest statesmen in advocating the adoption of an instrument which his caution at first led him to seriously doubt—he said:

Your situation will doubtless be improved by the adoption of the new Constitution, which, I hope, will have taken place before you receive this. I see in this instrument a great deal of good. The consolidation of our Government, a just representation, an administration of some permanence, and other features of great value will be gained by it. There are, indeed, some faults, which revolted me a great deal in the first moment, but we must be contented to travel on toward perfection step by step. We must be contented with the ground which this Constitution will gain for us, and hope that a favorable moment will come for correcting what is amiss in it.

Ah, Mr. President, what wisdom there is in those few sentences from the sage of Monticello. How wonderfully appropriate are they to this occasion. How easily can we imagine that if he were here now taking a part in this debate he might say to us as he said then, and I take the liberty of repeating his impressive words:

There are, indeed, some faults, which revolted me a great deal in the first moment, but we must be contented to travel on toward perfection step by step. We must be contented with the ground which this Constitution will gain for us, and hope that a favorable moment will come for correcting what is amiss in it.

I know of no better guide than that for us to follow. That was the position of the wisest and most far-sighted statesman this country has produced. He urged the adoption of the Constitution as it was and its improvement or amendment later. He did not favor the rejection of it in whole or in part, and thereby send it again into the chaos of another convention. He had some objections to it; but with his wonderful mind and his great patriotism he saw that the good in it outweighed what might be defective and that those defects could be removed by amendments subsequent to the adoption of the Constitution. As was generally the case with him, his vision was prophecy. He did not insist upon amendments before adoption, nor did he urge any "reservations," which would have delayed, if not defeated, the ratification of the Constitution.

But there were others, Mr. President—great men, too, but men who could not climb to the intellectual altitude of Jefferson—who preferred being consistent to being right and who would not avail themselves of that privilege which is usually exercised only by the very weak or the very great, and that is the privilege of changing one's opinion or position upon a subject in the light of wider information and of deeper thought. I do not wish to take up the time of the Senate by giving an account of many of these instances of distinguished opponents to the adoption of our Constitution. I shall therefore refer only to one or two others.

One of the most conspicuous and eloquent opponents was Patrick Henry, and his opposition to the ratification of the Constitution in the Virginia convention is historic and well known. No one for a moment would ever question the patriotism and courage of that man, whose thrilling oratory first hurled defiance at the British King and set afire the spirit of independence in the Colonies. And yet when the time came to make good that independence by the combination of the 13 States into a strong Federal Government no man fought more persistently or vigorously against it. He saw, as he thought, only danger and disaster if the Constitution should be adopted. With that power of speech for which he was famous, he described with burning words the evils which he thought would follow such a step.

In Wirt's Life of Patrick Henry he describes one occasion in the convention, and says:

Mr. Henry rose next. * * * Instead of proceeding to answer Mr. Nicholas, he commenced by sounding an alarm calculated to produce a most powerful impression. The effect, however, will be entirely lost upon the reader unless he shall associate with the speech, which I am about to lay before him, that awful solemnity and look of fearful portent by which Mr. Henry could imply even more than he expressed, and that slow, distinct, emphatic enunciation by which he never failed to move the souls of his hearers.

Does not that remind us, Mr. President, of some of the stirring eloquence to which we have listened on this floor in some speeches against the league of nations?

Further on Mr. Wirt says of him on this occasion:

The very tone of voice in which he would address the chairman when he felt the inspiration of his genius rising—"Mr. Chairman"—and the awful pause which followed this call fixed upon him at once every eye in the Assembly—

And so forth.

Let me give, Mr. President, a few extracts from some of Patrick Henry's speeches against the ratification of the Constitution. On one occasion he said:

I conceive the Republic to be in extreme danger; if our situation be thus uneasy, whence has arisen this fearful jeopardy? It arises from this fatal system; it arises from a proposal to change our Government; a proposal that goes to the utter annihilation of the most solemn engagements of the States; a proposal of establishing nine States into a confederacy to the eventual exclusion of our States.

Again, he says:

This proposal of altering our Federal Government is of a most alarming nature. Make the best of this new Government—say it is composed by anything but inspiration—you ought to be extremely cautious, watchful, jealous of your liberty; for instead of securing your rights you may lose them forever. If a wrong step be now made, the Republic may be lost forever. If this new Government will not come up to the expectation of the people, and they shall be disappointed, their liberty will be lost, and tyranny must and will arise. I repeat it again, and I beg gentlemen to consider, that a wrong step made now will plunge us into misery and our Republic will be lost.

But it is not necessary for me to give any further extracts from his speeches to show the very sincere and earnest alarm which he felt.

Another distinguished opponent of ratification in the Virginia convention said:

The confederation has been deservedly reprobated for its inadequacy to promote the public welfare. But this change is, in my opinion, very dangerous. It contemplates objects with which a Federal Government ought never to interfere.

He goes on further to enumerate some of his objections to the Constitution, and to express his fear of what would happen if it should be adopted. That, Mr. President, was James Monroe, who many years afterwards became President of the United States under that same Constitution which he had so vigorously opposed.

I might be permitted, Mr. President, here to suggest that the experience of James Monroe in that respect may offer some measure of consolation or of hope to any of our distinguished colleagues in the Senate opposing this league, whose ability and amiability eminently qualify them as eligible in the coming search for a presidential candidate of the Republican Party, and who may after all find themselves not totally disqualified for such a distinction by reason of their having opposed the ratification of this treaty as it is. However, I might remind them in a spirit of affectionate concern that after James

Monroe opposed the ratification of the Constitution he had to wait nearly 30 years before the presidential lightning struck him.

The fears which those misguided leaders in those days so earnestly felt and so eloquently expressed were never realized. Their visions of danger and disaster proved to be rhetorical delusions. The great common sense of the people prevailed. The people spoke. The Constitution was adopted. They took it with its imperfections, and as time went on they remedied it with amendments. And under that Constitution, what a wonderful record has been made! Framed as it was for the government of 13 States and three or four millions of people, it has proven itself strong enough and broad enough to embrace within its enfolding provisions the greatest Nation on earth, with 48 proud States, and with more than a hundred millions of the freest and happiest people on earth. What a glorious achievement it has been, and all in the comparatively brief period of less than a century and a half. And what, Mr. President, would have happened if the solemn warnings and the fiery eloquence of those patriotic leaders who opposed the adoption of the Constitution had prevailed? But thanks to that Divine Providence which guided us then, as it has so often done in our periods of danger, and as it will do in this crisis, the common sense of the people asserted itself, and gave to us this inheritance, the most priceless boon ever enjoyed by any people on earth.

Shall we now listen to the prophets of evil? Shall we be frightened by the ominous picture of gloom which they paint so luridly before our eyes? Shall we be dismayed by the vehemence of their arguments and eloquence? No, Mr. President, I believe not. Their arguments, however subtle and plausible; their eloquence, however impassioned and persuasive, are matched against the common sense of the people of this land who can see through it all, and with the principle of Jefferson to guide and inspire them they will say, "Give us this covenant of the league of nations now. It is the best plan that has ever been offered us to preserve international peace. It is the work of some of the wisest statesmen in the world. We shall take it as it is without amendment or reservation now, but improve it where time and experience may show its imperfections." That was the Jeffersonian idea in regard to the Constitution of the United States. That idea is as good now as it was then, and it is the idea which is rallying to the support of this document the great majority of the people of this country.

The peace of the world may be involved in our action. No more solemn responsibility ever came upon the Senate of the United States. A world wearied and sickened with bloodshed, broken and disabled with the ruin and devastation of the most destructive war in all human history, looks to us to put the seal of our approval upon this work of the peace conference, and give to it the one and only means which it believes will serve as any reasonable guaranty against war in the future. No advocate of this document can proclaim it perfect. No idealist can safely promise that it beyond all doubt removes the possibility of war in the future. But it at least comes to us with a promise that if given a fair trial, if improved where improvements may be found necessary later on, and if supported by the civilized governments of the earth, it will certainly be a tremendous advance over all previous plans, and one that may in reality fulfill the dream of its most enthusiastic advocates, a world-wide and an enduring peace.

I have not undertaken, Mr. President, to enter into a discussion of all of the details of this proposed league of nations. Those features of the discussion have been well and ably presented by other Senators. In my opinion, the technical arguments which have been so forcibly urged against the various articles of the treaty have been successfully met by others who have spoken for it.

The President of the United States has done a great work for his country and for all the world. He has labored in all these months at the table of the peace conference with the earnest effort and the sublime hope that out of its work there might come peace, justice, and freedom to all the people of the earth. He has brought back to us in the document now before us the result of that work. It represents the judgment and wisdom of the best thought of the civilized nations. The obligation is now upon us. The eyes of the world are watching us. The keen gaze and scrutiny of the people of this country will not fail to see the motives and purposes that may actuate us in what we do. We should dedicate to this subject the best thought, the highest patriotism of which we are capable. Their hope at present is in us, and we dare not and should not disappoint them.

PROPAGANDA ON PACKING INDUSTRY.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I had intended to submit some observations on the power of the propaganda of the packers to-day, but I note that there is only one speech scheduled for to-morrow on the league of nations and the treaty of peace. That being the case, I think I will postpone it until to-morrow. I give notice that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] I shall offer some observations on the propaganda of the meat packers.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened and (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, July 23, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 22, 1919.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

J. Parks Worley, of Bluff City, Tenn., to be United States marshal, eastern district of Tennessee, vice John R. Thompson, resigned.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

To be brigadier generals with rank from July 15, 1919.

Col. Charles R. Krauthoff, Quartermaster Corps (brigadier general, United States Army, emergency).

Col. Herbert M. Lord, Quartermaster Corps (brigadier general, United States Army, emergency).

MEDICAL CORPS.

Capt. Charles Augustus Pfeffer (Medical Corps, United States Army, emergency), to be first lieutenant in the Medical Corps from July 15, 1919.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

INFANTRY.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Maj. Robert S. Offley, Infantry, from July 2, 1919 (subject to examination required by law).

Maj. Samuel P. Lyon, Infantry, from July 2, 1919.

Maj. Charles H. Paine, Infantry, from July 2, 1919.

Maj. Thomas W. Darrah, Infantry, from July 9, 1919.

Maj. Americus Mitchell, Infantry, from July 9, 1919.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named temporary colonels to be lieutenant colonels in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Harold C. Snyder and

Alexander S. Williams.

The following-named temporary majors to be captains in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 23d day of May, 1917:

Charles A. Wynn,

Thad T. Taylor,

Glenn D. Miller,

Herbert Rosenzweig,

Thomas E. Watson,

Burwell H. Clarke,

Walter G. Sheard,

Paul Brown,

Roger W. Peard,

John D. Nevin,

Peter C. Geyer, jr.,

James E. Davis,

Lloyd L. Leech,

Charles P. Gilchrist,

Gustav Karow,

Joseph E. Brewster,

Raphael Griffin,

Karl I. Buse,

Harold S. Fassett,

Samuel A. Woods, jr.,

William C. Byrd,

George C. Hamner,

Arthur B. Jacques,

David H. Owen,

James M. Bain,

George B. Reynolds,

James T. Moore,
 Horace C. Cooper,
 John M. Arthur,
 Gordon Watt,
 Thomas P. Cheatham,
 Louis W. Whaley,
 William C. James,
 Thomas E. Bourke,
 James F. Jeffords,
 Benjamin T. Cripps,
 Jacob M. Pearce, jr.,
 Daniel E. Campbell,
 Maurice G. Holmes,
 Charles C. Gill,
 James E. Betts,
 Norman S. Hinman,
 George Faunce Adams,
 Wethered Woodworth,
 James W. Webb,
 John M. Tildsley,
 Le Roy P. Hunt,
 Louis E. Woods,
 Edward R. Rhodes,
 Donald R. Fox,
 William McN. Marshall,
 George H. Scott,
 Alexander Galt,
 Paul R. Cowley,
 Bailey M. Coffenberg,
 Eugene F. C. Collier,
 Evans O. Ames,
 Stanley M. Muckleston, and
 William H. Davis.

The following-named temporary captains to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Victor A. Barraco,
 Thomas O. Tate,
 James G. Somerville,
 Jack H. Tandy,
 Eric A. Johnston,
 William P. T. Hill,
 Robert A. Bowen, jr.,
 Philbrick W. Jackson,
 William W. Carson,
 Albert V. Williams,
 Harold B. Hoskins,
 Lucian H. Vandoren,
 Thornton Wilson,
 Daniel W. Bender,
 Clyde N. Bates,
 George H. Whisenhunt, jr.,
 Carl D. Brorein,
 Vincent J. Fitzgerald,
 Anthony W. Durell, jr.,
 William R. Brown,
 James M. Wallace,
 John G. Vowell,
 Lewis R. Stickles,
 William A. Eddy,
 Oliver T. Francis,
 Carlos H. McCullough,
 Cornelius H. Reece,
 Lemuel A. Haslup,
 James P. Adams,
 Edward A. Fellowes,
 Haskin U. Deeley,
 Sparling B. Anderson,
 Henry W. Paret, jr.,
 Louis F. Timmerman, jr.,
 Gordon M. F. Chance,
 George K. Campbell,
 Henry R. Heebner,
 Fred C. Eastin, jr.,
 Robert C. Kilmartin, jr.,
 Edward A. Craig,
 James E. Hunter, jr.,
 Julian P. Brown,
 William E. Riley,
 Albert G. Skelton,
 Walter S. Fant, jr.,
 Andrew L. W. Gordon,
 Percival L. Wilson,
 Bernard Dubel,

George C. Medary,
 Charles C. Simmons, jr.,
 Thomas G. Letchworth,
 Earle M. Randall,
 Leland S. Swindler,
 John P. Manton,
 Ernest H. Lowenthal,
 Ray A. Robinson,
 Howard N. Stent,
 Kenneth B. Collings,
 Basil Gordon,
 Donald Spicer,
 Ford O. Rogers,
 Creswell M. Micou,
 Walter G. Farrell,
 Raymond T. Presnell,
 Lloyd A. Houchin,
 William L. Harding, jr.,
 John B. Neill, jr.,
 David Duncan,
 Lyle C. DeVeaux,
 Ralph R. Robinson,
 Floyd W. Bennett,
 Norman E. True,
 Walter E. Bilisoly,
 John K. Martenstein,
 Francis J. Kelly, jr.,
 Conrad S. Grove, 3d,
 Charles M. Portis,
 St. Julien R. Childs,
 Hamilton M. H. Fleming,
 Walter I. Greth,
 Frederick E. Stack,
 George C. Collar,
 John F. Roy,
 Edward S. Shaw,
 Stanford H. Moses,
 Edward L. Pollock, jr.,
 Gardiner Hawkins,
 Leland D. Breckinridge,
 Merritt A. Edson,
 Laurence T. Stallings, jr.,
 Edgar A. Poe, jr.,
 Edward O. Bogert,
 John A. Tebbs,
 John C. Wemple,
 Curtis W. LeGette,
 Cleghorn Foote,
 Thomas B. McMartin,
 Thomas H. Raymond,
 David C. Levy,
 Joseph H. Fellows,
 Louis G. DeHaven,
 John S. Tyler,
 Luther W. Jones,
 Chester R. Milham,
 David P. Cowan,
 Robert L. Montague,
 Lester A. Dessez,
 John R. Minter,
 Robert B. Stuart,
 James Wood,
 Andrew R. Holderby, 3d,
 Fillmore W. Eiker,
 Timon J. Torkelson,
 Merton A. Richal,
 Robert A. Barnet, jr.,
 Francis B. Reed,
 Frank B. Wilbur,
 Lester D. Johnson,
 John Kaluf,
 Judson H. Fitzgerald, and
 Samuel A. Milliken.

The following-named temporary captains to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 18th day of July, 1918:

Henry D. F. Long,
 James Diskin,
 Ross L. Iams,
 Lee Carter,
 George Nielsen,
 Wyle J. Moore,
 Charles D. Baylis,
 Richard B. Dwyer,

William G. Kilgore,
Harry E. Leland,
Winfield S. Cranmer,
John F. Leslie,
David R. Nimmer,
Georges F. Krenn, and
Trevor G. Williams.

The following-named temporary captains to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 14th day of August, 1918:

David L. Ford and
Josephus Daniels, jr.

The following-named temporary captains to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 16th day of August, 1918:

Horace Talbot,
Edward B. Moore,
Frank W. Hemsoth,
Emil M. Northenscald,
David Kipness,
Robert K. Ryland,
William D. Wray,
Uley O. Stokes,
Charles P. Phelps,
Sherman L. Zea, and
Harold W. Whitney.

The following-named temporary first lieutenants to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 15th day of August, 1918:

Kenneth R. Berkey,
Ogbourne A. Hill,
Joseph F. Verhelle,
Gerald K. Hemsing,
Melvin E. Fuller,
Howard Mayes,
Robert B. Jeffrey,
Vincent M. O'Donnell,
George E. Gardner,
Walter Roll,
Paul Jahn,
Holton Y. Ditto,
Frank M. Keller,
Robert L. Wadell,
Claude B. Taugher,
Eldred I. Rawles,
Richard V. H. Ridgely,
Phillips T. Lehmer,
William T. Howze,
Bruce C. Lubers,
Joseph A. Yeager,
Francis I. Fenton,
Joseph De Paiva,
Thomas R. Wert,
Joseph L. Doll,
John W. Cunningham,
Samuel K. Eaves,
Alvan E. Stoddard,
Charles M. Adams,
Lindley H. Pryor,
Earl F. Lucas,
Elmer W. Johnson,
Charles H. Hassenmiller,
Hugh A. McGann,
Herbert B. Renninger,
Alfred J. Wainman,
William K. MacNulty,
Carlton E. Edwards,
Kenneth M. Stead,
Edwin J. Davenport,
Ralph W. Luce,
Marshall Y. Chapman,
Richard Cornelius,
William English,
George W. Hopke,
Frederick Israel,
Carl J. Norstrand,
Cecil J. Widdifield,
Frank Neider,
Morris C. Richardson,
George Belmont,
George B. Batten,
John T. Foster,
Russell M. Frederick,
Edward E. Lindgren,

Bayard Vasey,
Jesse L. Crandall,
Edward F. Dunk,
Harry L. Smith,
Robert L. Young,
Terrence J. Callan,
Paul J. Ogden,
William W. Rogers,
George F. Stockes,
William J. Whaling, and
Curtis T. Beecher.

The following-named temporary first lieutenants to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1919:

Walter Sweet,
Oliver D. Bernier,
Alfred Dickerson,
Rowan C. Pearce,
Axel Enholm,
Edward F. Bailey,
Stanley E. Ridderhof,
Willard R. Enk,
Eben C. Mann, 2d,
Elton C. Hersman,
Albert E. Gagnon,
Richard F. Cleveland,
Odilo N. Kass,
George L. Chumbley,
Wylie F. McKinnon, jr.,
Joseph Lubomski,
Samuel B. Witt,
Richard A. Cullum,
Charlton P. Lee,
Blaine G. Wiley,
Edwin G. Schwartzman,
George P. Buell,
Julian N. Frisbie,
Ervin R. Whitman,
Harry E. Leive,
William Scruggs,
Willard L. Peach,
Benjamin W. Atkinson, jr.,
Ralph C. Battin,
Gilbert C. Henderson,
Max D. Smith,
Anthony Rinkevich,
Carl J. Allenbaugh,
Minter L. Lowther,
Franklin H. Hayner,
Wilbur V. Styles,
Joseph Lacey,
George E. Ladd, jr.,
Herman Kingsnorth,
John A. Self,
Edward J. Moneypenny,
George S. Van Riper,
Alexander D. Shaw,
William L. McKittrick,
Gerald C. Thomas,
George Esau,
Philip W. Mohr,
Adolphus Cannon,
Albert L. Winner,
James T. Elliott,
Frank Saddler, jr.,
Howard B. Enyart,
William A. Keiter,
Herbert S. Keimling,
Ramie H. Dean,
Raymond P. James,
Fred J. Zinner,
Rueben E. Puphal,
Stephen Skoda,
Harold A. Strong,
James E. Foster,
Clarence L. Seward, jr.,
William A. Siefer,
Wilbur T. Love,
William S. Fellers,
Henning F. Adickes,
Roy W. Conkey,
Samuel H. Wood,
Merile H. Stevenson,
Augustus Paris,

Chester E. Orcutt,
 Louis B. West,
 Denzil R. Fowls,
 Forest J. Ashwood,
 George C. Buzby,
 Augustus H. Fricke,
 Edward M. Butler,
 Thomas J. Caldwell,
 Louis E. McDonald,
 George H. Towner, jr.,
 Robert A. Cobban,
 Stephen E. St. George,
 Louis Cukela,
 Emmons J. Robb,
 Allan S. Heaton,
 Erwin F. Schaefer,
 Daniel D. Thompson,
 Wilbur Summerlin,
 Charles F. Commings,
 Walter W. Wensinger,
 Robert O. Williams,
 John T. Stanton,
 Virgil P. Schuler,
 Harry S. Davis,
 Peter P. Wood,
 Lawrence E. Westerdahl,
 David N. Richeson,
 Merle J. Van Housen,
 James C. Leech,
 Richard S. Ross,
 Vinton H. Newell,
 Emmitt R. Wolfe,
 Stephen A. Norwood,
 Raymond A. O'Keefe,
 Frank M. Cross,
 George W. McHenry,
 Gale T. Cummings,
 Charles W. Holmes,
 Samuel H. Woods,
 Wilbur Eickelberg,
 Robert A. Butcher,
 Allen J. Burris, and
 Earl M. Rees.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 22, 1919.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Henry H. Watkins to be United States district judge for the western district of South Carolina.

MEMBER OF THE FARM LOAN BOARD.

Asbury F. Lever to be a member of the Farm Loan Board.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Henry Holland to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 7, with headquarters at Ogdensburg, N. Y.

CALIFORNIA DÉBRIS COMMISSION.

Col. E. Eveleth Winslow to be a member of the California Débris Commission.

UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

John Dalrymple Powell to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENTS, BY PROMOTION, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Count Harvey.
 Second Lieut. Roland Jens.
 Second Lieut. William E. Thrasher.
 Second Lieut. George W. Coffey.
 Second Lieut. George O. Consoer.
 Second Lieut. Theodore L. Welles, jr.
 Second Lieut. Conrad P. Hardy.
 Second Lieut. Ernest W. Dichman.
 Second Lieut. John H. Chase.
 Second Lieut. Edwin R. Harrah.
 Second Lieut. Albert Haertlein.
 Second Lieut. John C. Arrowsmith.
 Second Lieut. Edgar Marburg, jr.
 Second Lieut. Harry P. Hart.
 Second Lieut. Samuel J. Callahan.
 Second Lieut. John E. Wood.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, July 22, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Once more we have been called upon, our Heavenly Father, to witness a disgraceful riot in this peaceful city where laws are made and expected to be executed promptly and successfully.

Is it the effect of our public-school system, our churches and Sunday schools, or our home training? We do not know. Thou knowest all things. Point out to us, we pray Thee, clearly where the defects are and give us the grace to right them.

Take away from us the hateful thing we call race prejudice and help us to live in peace and harmony, law and order, justice and mercy. In the name of Him who taught us love and good will. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ABSENCE OF A QUORUM.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Clearly there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Goodall	Jones, Pa.	Morin
Ashbrook	Goodykoontz	Kahn	Neely
Browne	Greene, Vt.	Kearns	Newton, Mo.
Caldwell	Griest	Kettner	Olney
Doughton	Hamill	King	Purnell
Echols	Hamilton	LaGuardia	Ragsdale
Fairfield	Harrison	Lee, Ga.	Rouse
Fields	Hicks	Leshner	Sanford
Focht	Hull, Iowa	Lever	Scully
Fordney	Hull, Tenn.	McClintic	Sisson
Fuller, Mass.	Hutchinson	McCulloch	Slomp
Garland	Ireland	McKenzie	Tilson
Godwin, N. C.	James	Mason	Wise

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and eighty-two gentlemen have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. ECHOLS, of West Virginia, have the privilege of extending his remarks in the Record by inserting a patriotic address delivered by him in West Virginia on the 4th of July.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent that his colleague [Mr. ECHOLS] have the liberty of extending his remarks in the Record by inserting a Fourth of July address delivered in West Virginia. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What was the subject of that address?

Mr. REED of West Virginia. A patriotic address.

Mr. GALLIVAN. On what?

Mr. REED of West Virginia. I think there was some of the league of nations in it and other things—

Mr. GALLIVAN. Nothing about prohibition?

Mr. REED of West Virginia. No.

Mr. GALLIVAN. All right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes on the subject of conditions in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes on the subject of conditions in the District of Columbia. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LEVER, by unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, was granted leave of absence for 10 days on account of business.

NEAR EAST RELIEF.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Speaker lay before the House the bill S. 180 in order that it may be placed on its passage in lieu of the bill H. R. 412, the latter being a similar bill and No. 36 on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to take up the bill S. 180. But it is not in order until the previous question now pending is disposed of, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PROHIBITION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair places before the House the bill H. R. 6810, the prohibition-enforcement bill, on which the previous question has been ordered and which has been ordered to be engrossed and read a third time. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, did not some statesman over on that side demand the reading of the engrossed copy? The SPEAKER. The demand was made last night.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know it was, and it has never been complied with.

The SPEAKER. The Chair considers that the request is not now pending. Anybody can make the request now if he wishes to do so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to do so, but I wanted to know what became of that request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it died with the session, but anybody can make the demand now if he wishes to do so.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read a third time.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit, and on that I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Missouri opposed to the bill?

Mr. IGOE. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. IGOE moves to recommit the bill H. R. 6810 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That whoever, on or after the date when the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States goes into effect, shall knowingly manufacture, sell, or transport within the United States, or import into the United States or export from the United States, any intoxicating liquor for beverage purposes shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both, and for a second or subsequent offense shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"SEC. 2. That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, his assistants, agents, and inspectors, shall investigate and report violations of this act to the United States attorney for the district in which committed, who is hereby charged with the duty of prosecuting the offenders, subject to the direction of the Attorney General, as in the case of other offenses against the laws of the United States; and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, his assistants, agents, and inspectors, may swear out warrants before the United States commissioners or other officers of courts authorized to issue the same for the apprehension of such offenders. Section 1014 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is hereby made applicable in the enforcement of this act.

"SEC. 3. That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the Attorney General of the United States are hereby respectively authorized to appoint and employ such assistants, experts, clerks, and other employees as they may deem necessary for the enforcement of the provisions of this act, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required for the enforcement of this act."

The SPEAKER. On the foregoing motion the gentleman moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri demands the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 137, nays 256, answered "present" 2, not voting 35, as follows:

YEAS—137.

Ackerman	Campbell, Pa.	Donovan	Gard
Bakka	Cannon	Dooling	Garland
Bacharach	Carew	Doremus	Garner
Bee	Casey	Dupré	Glynn
Benson	Clark, Mo.	Dyer	Goldfogle
Blackmon	Clason	Eagan	Graham, Pa.
Bland, Mo.	Clary	Eagle	Greene, Mass.
Booher	Cody	Edmonds	Greene, Vt.
Britten	Crago	Elston	Griffin
Brooks, Pa.	Cullen	Fitzgerald	Haskell
Browning	Curry, Calif.	Freeman	Hays
Buchanan	Denison	Gallagher	Hull, Iowa
Burdick	Dent	Gallivan	Humphreys
Burke	Dewalt	Ganly	Husted

Igoe	McLane	O'Connell	Sherwood
Jefferts	McPherson	O'Connor	Siegel
Johnston, N. Y.	MacCrate	Ogden	Small
Juhl	MacGregor	Olney	Smith, N. Y.
Kahn	Madden	Paige	Snyder
Kennedy, R. I.	Magee	Pell	Steele
Klecicka	Maher	Phelan	Stephens, Ohio
LaGuardia	Mann	Platt	Sullivan
Lampert	Mansfield	Porter	Tinkham
Lazaro	Martin	Pou	Treadway
Lea, Calif.	Mead	Radcliffe	Vare
Lehlbach	Merritt	Rainey, J. W.	Voigt
Linthicum	Minahan, N. J.	Ramsey	Walsh
Loneragan	Moon	Randall, Wis.	Ward
Longworth	Mooney	Reber	Watson, Pa.
Lufkin	Moore, Pa.	Riordan	Welty
McAndrews	Morin	Rodenberg	Wilson, Pa.
McArthur	Mudd	Rogers	Winstow
McDuffie	Newton, Mo.	Rowan	
McGlennon	Nichols, Mich.	Sabath	
McKiniry	Nolan	Sanford	

NAYS—256.

Alexander	Emerson	Larsen	Scott
Almon	Esch	Layton	Sears
Anderson	Evans, Mont.	Little	Sells
Andrews, Md.	Evans, Nebr.	Luce	Shreve
Andrews, Nebr.	Evans, Nev.	Lubring	Sims
Anthony	Ferris	McCulloch	Sinclair
Aswell	Fess	McFadden	Sinnott
Ayres	Fields	McKenzie	Smith, Idaho
Baer	Fisher	McKeown	Smith, Ill.
Bankhead	Flood	McKinley	Smith, Mich.
Barbour	Fordney	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smithwick
Barkley	Foster	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Snell
Begg	Frear	Major	Steagall
Bell	French	Mapes	Stedman
Benham	Fuller, Ill.	Mays	Steenerson
Black	Fuller, Mass.	Michener	Stephens, Miss.
Bland, Ind.	Gandy	Miller	Stevenson
Bland, Va.	Garrett	Monahan, Wis.	Stiness
Blanton	Good	Mondell	Strong, Kans.
Boles	Goodwin, Ark.	Montague	Strong, Pa.
Bowers	Gould	Moore, Ohio	Summers, Wash.
Box	Graham, Ill.	Moore, Va.	Summers, Tex.
Brand	Green, Iowa	Moore, Ind.	Sweet
Briggs	Hadley	Morgan	Taylor, Colo.
Brinson	Hardy, Colo.	Mott	Taylor, Tenn.
Brooks, Ill.	Hastings	Murphy	Temple
Brumbaugh	Haugen	Nelson, Mo.	Thomas
Burroughs	Hawley	Nelson, Wis.	Thompson, Ohio
Butler	Hayden	Newton, Minn.	Thompson, Okla.
Byrnes, S. C.	Hedlin	Nicholls, S. C.	Tillman
Byrns, Tenn.	Hernandez	Oldfield	Timberlake
Campbell, Kans.	Hershey	Oliver	Tincher
Candler	Hersman	Osborne	Towner
Cantrill	Hickey	Overstreet	Upshaw
Caraway	Hill	Padgett	Vaile
Carss	Hoch	Park	Venable
Carter	Holland	Parker	Vestal
Chindblom	Houghton	Parrish	Vinson
Christopherson	Howard	Peters	Vinestead
Clark, Fla.	Huddleston	Quin	Walters
Cole	Hudspeth	Ragsdale	Wason
Collier	Hulings	Rainey, H. T.	Watkins
Connally	Jacoway	Raker	Watson, Va.
Cooper	James	Ramseyer	Weaver
Copey	Johnson, Ky.	Randall, Calif.	Webb
Crisp	Johnson, Miss.	Rayburn	Webster
Crowther	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reavis	Welling
Currie, Mich.	Johnson, Wash.	Reed, N. Y.	Whaley
Dale	Jones, Tex.	Reed, W. Va.	Wheeler
Dallinger	Kearns	Rhodes	White, Kans.
Darrow	Kelley, Mich.	Ricketts	White, Me.
Davey	Kelly, Pa.	Riddick	Williams
Davis, Minn.	Kendall	Robinson, N. C.	Wilson, Ill.
Davis, Tenn.	Kennedy, Iowa	Robison, Ky.	Wilson, La.
Dempsey	Kiess	Romjue	Wingo
Dickinson, Mo.	Kincheloe	Rose	Wise
Dickinson, Iowa	Kinkaid	Rowe	Wood, Ind.
Dominick	Kitchin	Rubey	Woods, Va.
Dowell	Knutson	Rucker	Woodyard
Drane	Kraus	Sanders, Ind.	Wright
Dunbar	Kreider	Sanders, La.	Yates
Dunn	Langley	Sanders, N. Y.	Young, N. Dak.
Elliott	Lanham	Saunders, Va.	Young, Tex.
Ellsworth	Lankford	Schall	Zihlman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Costello

NOT VOTING—35.

Ashbrook	Goodall	Ireland	Neely
Browne	Goodykoontz	Jones, Pa.	Purnell
Caldwell	Griest	Kettner	Rouse
Cramton	Hamill	King	Scully
Doughton	Hamilton	Lee, Ga.	Sisson
Echols	Harrison	Lester	Slomp
Fairfield	Hicks	Lever	Taylor, Ark.
Focht	Hull, Tenn.	McClintic	Tilson
Godwin, N. C.	Hutchinson	Mason	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. SCULLY (for) with Mr. HUTCHINSON (against).

Mr. CRAIG (for) with Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania (against).

Mr. HARDY of Texas (for) with Mr. DOUGHTON (against).

Mr. HAMILL (for) with Mr. IRELAND (against).

Mr. CALDWELL (for) with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas (against).
Until further notice:

Mr. MERRITT with Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. KING with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. PURNELL with Mr. MCCLINTIC.

Mr. HICKS with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.

Mr. FOCHT with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.

Mr. GRIEST with Mr. LESHNER.

Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. LEE of Georgia.

Mr. MASON with Mr. KETNER.

Mr. TILSON with Mr. LEVER.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. SISSON.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall, listening?

Mr. CRAMTON. I was in the front row of seats, and did not hear my name called.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes the gentleman to answer that question.

Mr. CRAMTON. I can not say how particularly or how closely I was listening.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman listening?

Mr. CRAMTON. I could not say as to how closely I was listening.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must leave it to the gentleman to qualify himself.

Mr. CRAMTON. I was in the Hall, in the front row of seats, and failed to hear my name called.

The SPEAKER. Unless the gentleman can answer the question in the affirmative, he can not vote.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES. Mr. JONES is in favor of this bill and wanted to vote for it, but is unavoidably absent. I take it that he would have voted against the motion to recommit. Therefore I wish to change my vote from "aye" to "present" and have myself recorded as paired with Mr. JONES on this and following questions.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to vote "nay."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall, listening, when his name was called?

Mr. KNUTSON. I thought my name was called and started to answer and they had gone on beyond.

The SPEAKER. The rule is very clear. If the gentleman answers in the affirmative, he can vote.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would like to ask the Speaker under what provision of the Constitution my district is to be deprived of a vote?

The SPEAKER. That is not a proper question. Was the gentleman in the Hall, listening?

Mr. KNUTSON. I was.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman can vote.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. KNUTSON, and he voted in the negative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the passage of the bill will, when their names are called, answer "aye"; those opposed will answer "no."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 287, nays 100, answered "present" 3, not voting 40, as follows:

YEAS—287.

Ackerman	Brooks, Ill.	Crowther	Ferris
Alexander	Browning	Currie, Mich.	Fess
Almon	Brumbaugh	Dale	Fields
Anderson	Burroughs	Dallinger	Fisher
Andrews, Md.	Butler	Darrow	Flood
Andrews, Nebr.	Byrnes, S. C.	Davey	Fordney
Anthony	Byrns, Tenn.	Davis, Minn.	Foster
Aswell	Campbell, Kans.	Davis, Tenn.	Frear
Ayres	Candler	Dempsey	French
Baer	Cannon	Denison	Fuller, Ill.
Bankhead	Cantrill	Dickinson, Mo.	Fuller, Mass.
Barbour	Caraway	Dickinson, Iowa	Gandy
Barkley	Carrs	Dominick	Garner
Begg	Carter	Doremus	Garrett
Bell	Chindblom	Dowell	Good
Benham	Christopherson	Drane	Goodwin, Ark.
Benson	Clark, Fla.	Dunbar	Gould
Bland, Ind.	Clark, Mo.	Dunn	Graham, Ill.
Bland, Mo.	Classon	Eagle	Green, Iowa
Bland, Va.	Cole	Elliott	Greene, Mass.
Blanton	Collier	Ellsworth	Greene, Vt.
Boies	Connally	Elston	Hadley
Bowers	Cooper	Emerson	Hardy, Colo.
Box	Copley	Esch	Hastings
Brand	Costello	Evans, Mont.	Haugen
Briggs	Cramton	Evans, Nebr.	Hawley
Brinson	Crisp	Evans, Nev.	Hayden

Hays	McKenzie	Randall, Calif.	Taylor, Colo.
Hedlin	McKeown	Randall, Wis.	Taylor, Tenn.
Hernandez	McKinley	Rayburn	Temple
Hersey	McLaughlin, Mich.	Reavis	Thomas
Hersman	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Reed, N. Y.	Thompson, Ohio
Hickey	McPherson	Reed, W. Va.	Thompson, Okla.
Hill	MacGregor	Rhodes	Tillman
Hoch	Magee	Ricketts	Timberlake
Holland	Major	Riddick	Tincher
Houghton	Mansfield	Robinson, N. C.	Towner
Howard	Mapes	Robison, Ky.	Treadway
Huddleston	Mays	Rogers	Upshaw
Hudspeth	Michener	Romjue	Valle
Hulings	Miller	Rose	Venable
Jacoway	Monahan, Wis.	Rowe	Vestal
James	Mondell	Rubey	Vinson
Johnson, Ky.	Montague	Rucker	Volstead
Johnson, Miss.	Moore, Ohio	Sanders, Ind.	Walters
Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Va.	Sanders, La.	Wason
Johnson, Wash.	Moores, Ind.	Sanders, N. Y.	Watkins
Jones, Tex.	Morgan	Sanders, Va.	Watson, Va.
Kearns	Mott	Schall	Weaver
Kelley, Mich.	Murphy	Scott	Webb
Kelly, Pa.	Nelson, Mo.	Sears	Webster
Kendall	Nelson, Wis.	Sells	Welty
Kennedy, Iowa	Newton, Minn.	Shreve	Whaley
Kiess	Nicholls, S. C.	Sims	Wheeler
Kincheloe	Nichols, Mich.	Sinclair	White, Kans.
Kinkaid	Oldfield	Sinnott	White, Me.
Kitchin	Oliver	Smith, Idaho	Williams
Knutson	Olney	Smith, Ill.	Wilson, Ill.
Kraus	Osborne	Smith, Mich.	Wilson, La.
Kreider	Overstreet	Smithwick	Wilson, Pa.
Langley	Padgett	Snell	Wingo
Lanham	Paige	Steagall	Winslow
Lankford	Park	Stedman	Wise
Larsen	Parker	Steenerson	Wood, Ind.
Layton	Parrish	Stephens, Miss.	Woods, Va.
Little	Peters	Stevenson	Woodyard
Luce	Platt	Stiness	Wright
Lufkin	Quin	Strong, Kans.	Yates
Luhning	Ragsdale	Strong, Pa.	Young, N. Dak.
McCulloch	Rainey, H. T.	Summers, Wash.	Young, Tex.
McDuffie	Raker	Summers, Tex.	Zihlman
McFadden	Ramsayer	Sweet	

NAYS—100.

Babka	Gallivan	Longworth	Porter
Bacharach	Ganly	McAndrews	Pou
Bee	Gard	McArthur	Radcliffe
Blackmon	Garland	McGlennon	Rainey, J. W.
Britten	Glynn	McKinley	Ramsey
Buchanan	Goldfogle	McLane	Reber
Burdick	Griffin	MacCrate	Riordan
Burke	Haskell	Madden	Rodenberg
Carew	Hull, Iowa	Maher	Rowan
Casey	Humphreys	Mann	Sabath
Cleary	Husted	Martin	Sanford
Coady	Igoe	Mead	Sherwood
Cullen	Jeffers	Merritt	Stegel
Curry, Calif.	Johnston, N. Y.	Minahan, N. J.	Small
Dent	Juul	Mooney	Smith, N. Y.
Dewalt	Kahn	Moore, Pa.	Snyder
Donovan	Kennedy, R. I.	Morin	Steele
Doolling	Klecza	Mudd	Stephens, Ohio
Dupré	LaGuardia	Newton, Mo.	Sullivan
Dyer	Lampert	Nolan	Tinkham
Eagan	Lazaro	O'Connell	Vare
Edmonds	Lea, Calif.	O'Connor	Voigt
Fitzgerald	Leibach	Ogden	Walsh
Freeman	Linthcum	Pell	Ward
Gallagher	Loneragan	Phelan	Watson, Pa.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Booher	Crage	Graham, Pa.
--------	-------	-------------

NOT VOTING—40.

Ashbrook	Godwin, N. C.	Hutchinson	Moon
Black	Goodall	Ireland	Neely
Brooks, Pa.	Goodykoontz	Jones, Pa.	Purnell
Browne	Griest	Kettner	Rouse
Caldwell	Hamill	King	Scully
Campbell, Pa.	Hamilton	Lee, Ga.	Sisson
Doughton	Hardy, Tex.	Leshner	Slemp
Echols	Harrison	Lever	Taylor, Ark.
Fairfield	Hicks	McClintic	Tilson
Focht	Hull, Tenn.	Mason	Welling

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. GRIEST with Mr. BOOHER.

Mr. FOCHT with Mr. LESHNER.

Mr. BROWN with Mr. WELLING.

On this vote:

Mr. ASHBROOK (for) with Mr. MERRITT (against).

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas (for) with Mr. CALDWELL (against).

Mr. IRELAND (for) with Mr. HAMILL (against).

Mr. HUTCHINSON (for) with Mr. SCULLY (against).

Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. CRAGO (against).

Mr. DOUGHTON (for) with Mr. HARDY of Texas (against).

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The announcement of the vote was received with applause.

On motion of Mr. VOLSTEAD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

REQUEST TO PRINT.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the prohibition bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed. Is there objection?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I object.

LEAVE TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to file the views of the minority on H. R. 7500. It is agreed by the committee that that may be done.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks leave to file the views of the minority on H. R. 7500—from what committee?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MINIMUM COMPENSATION.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the minimum-compensation bill, H. R. 5726, and ask that it be placed on its final passage.

The SPEAKER. The business before the House is the minimum-wage bill, H. R. 5726, on which the previous question was ordered last Wednesday. The bill has been ordered to be engrossed and read a third time. The next thing in order is the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read a third time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I am opposed to it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Labor with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: Add a new section properly numbered, as follows:

"Sec. —. It is specially provided that after a proclamation of peace is made by the President the bonus of \$240 per annum shall be no longer paid to employees affected by this minimum-wage bill, but that \$3 per day and \$90 per month shall be the maximum received by said employees."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, upon that I move the previous question, and I ask for the yeas and nays on the vote.

The SPEAKER. The first question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to recommit.

Mr. BLANTON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused, one Member, not a sufficient number, seconding the demand.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 1, noes 219.

Accordingly the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. On that I ask for a division.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 328, nays 48, not voting 54, as follows:

YEAS—328.

Ackerman	Brooks, Ill.	Costello	Elliott
Alexander	Brooks, Pa.	Crago	Ellsworth
Almon	Browning	Cramton	Elston
Anderson	Brumbaugh	Crowther	Emerson
Andrews, Md.	Burdick	Cullen	Esch
Andrews, Nebr.	Burke	Currie, Mich.	Evans, Mont.
Anthony	Burroughs	Curry, Calif.	Evans, Nebr.
Ayres	Butler	Dale	Evans, Nev.
Babka	Byrns, Tenn.	Dallinger	Ferris
Bacharach	Campbell, Kans.	Darrow	Fess
Bankhead	Campbell, Pa.	Davey	Fields
Barbour	Cannon	Davis, Minn.	Fisher
Barkley	Cantrill	Dempsey	Fitzgerald
Bee	Caraway	Dewalt	Fordney
Begg	Carew	Dickinson, Iowa	Foster
Benham	Carss	Donovan	Frear
Benson	Carter	Dooling	Freeman
Blackmon	Casey	Doremus	French
Bland, Ind.	Chindblom	Dowell	Fuller, Ill.
Bland, Mo.	Christopherson	Drane	Fuller, Mass.
Bland, Va.	Clark, Mo.	Dunbar	Gallagher
Boies	Classon	Dunn	Gallivan
Bowers	Cleary	Dupré	Gandy
Box	Coady	Dyer	Ganly
Briggs	Cole	Eagan	Gard
Brinson	Cooper	Eagle	Garland
Britten	Copley	Edmonds	Glynn

Goldfogle	Lea, Calif.	O'Connor	Smith, N. Y.
Good	Lehlbach	Oldfield	Snell
Goodwin, Ark.	Linthicum	Olney	Snyder
Gould	Little	Osborne	Stedman
Graham, Pa.	Loneragan	Overstreet	Steenerson
Graham, Ill.	Luce	Padgett	Stephens, Ohio
Green, Iowa	Lufkin	Paige	Stiness
Greene, Mass.	Luring	Parker	Strong, Kans.
Greene, Vt.	McAndrews	Parrish	Strong, Pa.
Hadley	McArthur	Pell	Sullivan
Hardy, Colo.	McCulloch	Peters	Summers, Wash.
Haskell	McDuffie	Phelan	Summers, Tex.
Hastings	McFadden	Platt	Sweet
Haugen	McGlennon	Porter	Taylor, Colo.
Hawley	McKenzie	Pou	Taylor, Tenn.
Hayden	McKeown	Radcliffe	Temple
Hays	McKintry	Rainey, H. T.	Thompson, Ohio
Hernandez	McLane	Rainey, J. W.	Thompson, Okla.
Hersey	McLaughlin, Mich.	Raker	Tillman
Hersman	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Ramsey	Timberlake
Hickey	MacCrate	Ramsayer	Tincher
Hill	MacGregor	Randall, Calif.	Tinkham
Hoch	Madden	Randall, Wis.	Towner
Houghton	Magge	Reavis	Treadway
Hudspeth	Maher	Reed, N. Y.	Upshaw
Hulings	Major	Reed, W. Va.	Vailo
Hull, Iowa	Mann	Rhodes	Vare
Husted	Mapes	Ricketts	Vestal
Igoe	Martin	Riddick	Voigt
Jacoway	Mays	Riordan	Volstead
James	Mead	Robison, Ky.	Walsh
Jeffers	Merritt	Rodenberg	Walters
Johnson, S. Dak.	Michener	Rogers	Ward
Johnson, Wash.	Miller	Romjue	Wason
Johnston, N. Y.	Minahan, N. J.	Rose	Watkins
Jones, Tex.	Monahan, Wis.	Rowan	Watson, Pa.
Juni	Mondell	Rowe	Watson, Va.
Kahn	Montague	Sabath	Weaver
Kearns	Moon	Sanders, Ind.	Webster
Kelly, Pa.	Mooney	Sanders, La.	Wellington
Kendall	Moore, Ohio	Sanders, N. Y.	Welty
Kennedy, Iowa	Moore, Pa.	Sanford	Whaley
Kennedy, R. I.	Moore, Va.	Schall	Wheeler
Kless	Moore, Ind.	Scott	White, Kans.
Kinkaid	Morgan	Sears	White, Me.
Klecza	Morin	Sells	Williams
Kraus	Mudd	Sherwood	Wilson, Ill.
Kreider	Murphy	Shreve	Wilson, Pa.
LaGuardia	Nelson, Mo.	Siegel	Wingo
Lampert	Nelson, Wis.	Sims	Winslow
Langley	Newton, Minn.	Sinclair	Wood, Ind.
Lanham	Newton, Mo.	Sinnot	Woodyard
Lankford	Nichols, Mich.	Smith, Idaho	Yates
Layton	Nolan	Smith, Ill.	Young, N. Dak.
Lazaro	O'Connell	Smith, Mich.	Zihlman

NAYS—48.

Aswell	Davis, Tenn.	Kitchin	Saunders, Va.
Bell	Dent	Larsen	Small
Black	Dickinson, Mo.	Mansfield	Stegall
Blanton	Dominick	Nichols, S. C.	Stephens, Miss.
Booher	Flood	Oliver	Stevenson
Brand	Garner	Park	Thomas
Buchanan	Garrett	Quin	Venable
Byrnes, S. C.	Hardy, Tex.	Ragsdale	Vinson
Candler	Heflin	Rayburn	Wilson, La.
Clark, Fla.	Holland	Robinson, N. C.	Woods, Va.
Collier	Humphreys	Ruby	Wright
Connally	Kincheloe	Rucker	Young, Tex.

NOT VOTING—54.

Ashbrook	Griffin	Kettner	Purnell
Baer	Hamill	King	Reber
Browne	Hamilton	Knutson	Rouse
Caldwell	Harrison	Lee, Ga.	Scully
Crisp	Hicks	Leshner	Sisson
Denison	Howard	Lever	Slomp
Doughton	Huddleston	Longworth	Smithwick
Echols	Hull, Tenn.	McClintic	Steele
Fairfield	Hutchinson	McKinley	Taylor, Ark.
Focht	Ireland	McPherson	Tilson
Godwin, N. C.	Johnson, Ky.	Mason	Webb
Goodall	Johnson, Miss.	Mott	Wise
Goodykoontz	Jones, Pa.	Neely	
Griest	Kelley, Mich.	Ogden	

So the bill was passed.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. MCPHERSON with Mr. SMITHWICK.

Mr. MOTT with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin with Mr. WISE.

Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. STEELE.

Mr. BROWNE with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. DENISON with Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania with Mr. DOUGHTON.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi.

Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. WEBB.

Mr. IRELAND with Mr. HAMILL.

On this vote:

Mr. HUTCHINSON (for the bill) with Mr. CRISP (against).

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. NOLAN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. GOODYKOONTZ, is fulfilling the promise he made some time

ago to address the West Virginia Bar Association. If he had been present, he would have voted for the prohibition bill and also for the minimum-wage bill.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. CRAMTON. Upon what subject?

Mr. SMALL. On prohibition.

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, I do not see the gentleman from Massachusetts present.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I am here; just came in.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I object.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, there must be some mistake; I do not think the gentleman from Massachusetts intended to object to my request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts did object.

Mr. SMALL. I renew my request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of prohibition. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, it occurs to me that such a permission should be granted to gentlemen on both sides alike.

Mr. HEFLIN. That is so, and I would like to extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. Speaker, I object.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Cravens, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 183. An act providing additional time for the payment of purchase money under homestead entries of lands within the former Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 183. An act providing additional time for the payment of purchase money under homestead entries of lands within the former Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

NEAR EAST RELIEF.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Chair to lay before the House the bill S. 180, a similar bill being on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the bill S. 180, a similar bill having been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary of the House.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, before that is done I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a point of order. I am willing to reserve the point of order.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I would like to have the gentleman state his point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. I also reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is not asking unanimous consent.

Mr. CRAMTON. I did not hear the gentleman's request then.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. It is a Senate bill on the Speaker's table, and a similar bill being on the House Calendar I ask that the Senate bill be laid before the House and put upon its passage.

Mr. CRAMTON. The point I desire to make is that the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is based on the rule which provides that this procedure may obtain where a similar bill has first been reported from the House committee, which was not true in this case.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has made inquiry and is informed that that is the fact, that it was reported and by the parliamentary clerk referred to the calendar before the Senate bill came over.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. That is the fact.

Mr. CRAMTON. The bill which I have in my hand, and upon which I have depended, shows that the House bill was referred to the House Calendar on July 15. That appears in the print of H. R. 412, which I have in my hand.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. When was the Senate bill brought over?

Mr. WALSH. On the same day.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Is it not true that the House bill came from the Committee on the

Judiciary and was received at the Speaker's desk before the Senate bill was passed?

Mr. CRAMTON. That is a question of fact on which I will yield to the statement—

Mr. GARD. My information is that it was.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the Senate bill came over on July 15 and that before the Senate bill came over this bill was referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it within the rule of the House for a gentleman to rise in his place any day in the week on a matter that is not privileged and ask that a certain bill on the Speaker's table be placed before the House for consideration? Does it not require unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. It does not require unanimous consent.

Mr. MADDEN. The Chair rules that the mere fact that the bill comes from the Senate gives it a privilege without respect to whether we are calling committees or not, a privilege that the House bill does not enjoy.

The SPEAKER. It has this privilege, that when the House committee has reported a similar bill the Senate bill is privileged, the theory being that it is to expedite business; that the Senate having passed the bill and the House committee having reported the bill, the bill is privileged.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This bill is on the House Calendar as reported from the Committee on the Judiciary. Is that the bill that is now called up for consideration?

The SPEAKER. The rule requires that it be substantially the same bill. The Chair has not examined it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. The bills are identical, the House bill and the Senate bill.

Mr. MADDEN. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. If there was no Senate bill, and the House bill was on the calendar, would it be privileged to call up the House bill at this time?

The SPEAKER. It would not.

Mr. MADDEN. What is there in the Senate bill which gives it a privilege which the House bill does not enjoy?

The SPEAKER. Section 2 of Rule XXIV gives the bill that privilege.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, if this bill is to come up, what provision is there for debate and amendment?

The SPEAKER. It will be considered under the regular rules of the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], having charge of the bill, will have an hour, and unless he moves the previous question within the hour the bill would be before the House as any other bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to state what his purpose is in respect to debate? Does he intend to move the previous question after he has used his hour?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I had no idea that there would be any opposition to this bill, which is very simple in its character and which does not affect any public question. It is a bill reported from the Committee on the Judiciary to incorporate a charity that is doing a great work, that can not be done by anyone else, in the Near East.

Mr. CRAMTON. In its present form I shall be obliged to oppose the bill, and would like some time.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I simply ask for fair play in the consideration of the bill, and it is not my purpose to shut off anyone who wants to legitimately debate the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. But who is going to decide whether the debate is legitimate? The gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. To some extent.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think that is a fair statement of the case.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, is not the question of consideration now in order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then I raise the question of consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania raises the question of consideration. The question is, Shall the House now consider the bill?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 87, noes 19.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas, that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 16, noes 110.

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Obviously there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees. The question is, Shall the House consider the bill? Those in favor will, as their names are called, answer "aye"; those opposed, "no." The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 276, nays 75, answered "present" 3, not voting 76, as follows:

YEAS—276.

Ackerman	Dyer	Lankford	Riddick
Alexander	Eagan	Larsen	Riordan
Anderson	Eagle	Lazaro	Robinson, N. C.
Andrews, Md.	Edmonds	Leibach	Robison, Ky.
Andrews, Nebr.	Elliot	Linthicum	Rogers
Anthony	Ellsworth	Loneragan	Romjue
Babka	Elston	Luce	Rose
Bacharach	Emerson	Lufkin	Rowe
Bankhead	Esch	Luhning	Rubey
Barbour	Evans, Mont.	McAndrews	Sabath
Barkley	Evans, Nebr.	McArthur	Sanders, Ind.
Bee	Evans, Nev.	McGlennon	Sanders, La.
Begg	Fess	McKiniry	Sanders, N. Y.
Bell	Fields	McKinley	Sanford
Benson	Fisher	McLane	Saunders, Va.
Black	Fitzgerald	McPherson	Scott
Bland, Mo.	Fordney	MacCrate	Siegel
Bland, Va.	Foster	Magee	Sinclair
Blanton	Freeman	Maher	Sinnot
Boies	French	Mann	Small
Booher	Fuller, Ill.	Mansfield	Smith, Idaho
Bowers	Fuller, Mass.	Mapes	Smith, Ill.
Box	Gallagher	Martin	Snyder
Brand	Gallivan	Mays	Stedman
Briggs	Gandy	Mead	Steele
Brinson	Ganly	Merritt	Steenerson
Britten	Gard	Miller	Stiness
Brooks, Ill.	Garland	Minahan, N. J.	Strong, Pa.
Brooks, Pa.	Goldfogle	Monahan, Wis.	Summers, Wash.
Browning	Good	Mondell	Sumners, Tex.
Brumbaugh	Goodwin, Ark.	Montague	Taylor, Colo.
Buchanan	Gould	Moon	Taylor, Tenn.
Burdick	Graham, Pa.	Mooney	Temple
Burke	Green, Iowa	Moore, Ohio	Thompson, Okla.
Burroughs	Griest	Moore, Va.	Tillman
Byrnes, S. C.	Griffin	Morgan	Timberlake
Byrns, Tenn.	Hadley	Morin	Tincher
Campbell, Pa.	Hardy, Colo.	Mudd	Tinkham
Candler	Hardy, Tex.	Murphy	Towner
Caraway	Haskell	Nelson, Mo.	Treadway
Cars	Hawley	Nelson, Wis.	Upshaw
Carter	Hayden	Newton, N. Y.	Vaile
Casey	Hernandez	Nicholls, S. C.	Vare
Chindblom	Hickey	Nolan	Vestal
Christopherson	Hill	O'Connell	Vinson
Clark, Mo.	Hoch	O'Connor	Voigt
Cleary	Holland	Ogden	Volstead
Coady	Houghton	Oldfield	Walters
Cole	Howard	Osborne	Ward
Collier	Hudspeth	Overstreet	Wason
Connally	Hulings	Padgett	Watkins
Cooper	Hull, Iowa	Paige	Watson, Pa.
Copley	Humphreys	Park	Watson, Va.
Costello	Husted	Parker	Weaver
Crowther	Igoe	Parrish	Webster
Cullen	Jacoway	Pell	Welty
Currie, Mich.	Johnson, Wash.	Peters	Whaley
Dallinger	Johnston, N. Y.	Phelan	Wheeler
Darrow	Jones, Tex.	Platt	White, Me.
Davey	Juhl	Pou	Wilson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	Kahn	Quin	Winslow
Dempsey	Kelly, Pa.	Ragsdale	Wise
Dewalt	Kendall	Rainey, H. T.	Wood, Ind.
Dominick	Klecza	Rainey, J. W.	Woods, Va.
Donovan	Knutson	Ramsey	Wright
Drane	Kraus	Ramseyer	Yates
Dunbar	Kreider	Randall, Wis.	Young, N. Dak.
Dunn	LaGuardia	Rayburn	Young, Tex.
Dupré	Lanham	Reed, W. Va.	Zihlman

NAYS—75.

Aswell	Garrett	McKenzie	Shreve
Ayres	Glynn	McKeown	Smith, Mich.
Baer	Graham, Ill.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Snell
Blackmon	Greene, Mass.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Stegall
Bland, Ind.	Greene, Vt.	Madden	Stephens, Miss.
Cannon	Heflin	Michener	Stephens, Ohio
Carew	Hersey	Moore, Pa.	Strong, Kans.
Clark, Fla.	Huddleston	Moore, Ind.	Sweet
Classon	James	Newton, Mo.	Thomas
Crago	Jeffers	Porter	Thompson, Ohio
Cranston	Johnson, S. Dak.	Radcliffe	Venable
Crisp	Kearns	Raker	Walsh
Curry, Calif.	Kiess	Reavis	Welling
Dale	Kincheloe	Rhodes	White, Kans.
Denison	Lampert	Ricketts	Williams
Dent	Langley	Rodenberg	Wilson, Ill.
Dickinson, Mo.	Layton	Schall	Wingo
Dickinson, Iowa	McCulloch	Sears	Woodyard
Garner	McDuffie	Sells	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Kinkaid	Lea, Calif.	Little	
			NOT VOTING—76.
Almon	Godwin, N. C.	Kennedy, R. I.	Randall, Calif.
Ashbrook	Goodall	Kettner	Reber
Benham	Goodykoontz	King	Reed, N. Y.
Browne	Hamill	Kitchin	Rouse
Butler	Hamilton	Lee, Ga.	Rowan
Caldwell	Harrison	Leshner	Rucker
Campbell, Kans.	Hastings	Lever	Scully
Cantrill	Haugen	Longworth	Sherwood
Davis, Minn.	Hays	McClintic	Sims
Dooling	Hersman	McFadden	Sisson
Doremus	Hicks	MacGregor	Slomp
Doughton	Hull, Tenn.	Major	Smith, N. Y.
Dowell	Hutchinson	Mason	Smithwick
Echols	Ireland	Mott	Stevenson
Fairfield	Johnson, Ky.	Neely	Sullivan
Ferris	Johnson, Miss.	Nichols, Mich.	Taylor, Ark.
Flood	Jones, Pa.	Oliver	Tilson
Focht	Kelley, Mich.	Olney	Webb
Frear	Kennedy, Iowa	Purnell	Wilson, Pa.

So the House decided to consider the bill.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. DOWELL with Mr. ALMON.

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. CANTRILL.

Mr. HAYS with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota with Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. FREAR with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. MAJOR.

Mr. BENHAM with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. MCFADDEN with Mr. DOREMUS.

Mr. MACGREGOR with Mr. OLNEY.

Mr. REED of New York with Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. BUTLER with Mr. RANDALL of California.

Mr. TILSON with Mr. SHERWOOD.

Mr. BROWNE with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. ECHOLS with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. FAIRFIELD with Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. GOODALL with Mr. SMITHWICK.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. KINKAID with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.

Mr. REBER with Mr. CALDWELL.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 180) to incorporate Near East Relief.

Be it enacted, etc., That the following persons, namely, James L. Barton, Cleveland H. Dodge, Henry Morgenthau, Edwin M. Bulkley, Alexander J. Hemphill, Charles R. Crane, William Howard Taft, Charles Evans Hughes, Elihu Root, Abram I. Elkus, Charles W. Elliot, Harry Pratt Judson, Charles E. Beury, Arthur J. Brown, John B. Calvert, William I. Chamberlain, Robert J. Cuddihy, Cleveland E. Dodge, William T. Ellis, James Cardinal Gibbons, David H. Greer, Harold A. Hatch, William I. Haven, Myron T. Herriek, Hamilton Holt, Frank W. Jackson, Arthur Curtiss James, Frederick Lynch, Vance C. McCormick, Charles S. Macfarland, Henry B. F. Macfarland, William B. Millar, John R. Mott, Frank Mason North, George A. Plimpton, Philip Rhineland, William Jay Schieffelin, George T. Scott, Albert Shaw, William Sloane, Edward Lincoln Smith, Robert Eliot Speer, James M. Speers, Oscar S. Straus, Charles V. Vickrey, Harry A. Wheeler, Stanley White, Ray Lyman Wilbur, Talcott Williams, and Stephen S. Wise, their associates and successors duly chosen, are hereby incorporated and declared to be a body corporate of the District of Columbia by the name of Near East Relief and by that name shall be known and have perpetual succession, with the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

Sec. 2. That the object for which said corporation is incorporated shall be to provide relief and to assist in the repatriation, rehabilitation, and reestablishment of suffering and dependent people of the Near East and adjacent areas; to provide for the care of orphans and widows and to promote the social, economic, and industrial welfare of those who have been rendered destitute, or dependent directly or indirectly, by the vicissitudes of war, the cruelties of men, or other causes beyond their control.

Sec. 3. That the direction and management of the affairs of the corporation, and the control of its property and funds, shall be vested in a board of trustees, to be composed of the following individuals: James L. Barton, Cleveland H. Dodge, Henry Morgenthau, Edwin M. Bulkley, Alexander J. Hemphill, Charles R. Crane, William Howard Taft, Charles Evans Hughes, Elihu Root, Abram I. Elkus, Charles W. Elliot, Harry Pratt Judson, Charles E. Beury, Arthur J. Brown, John B. Calvert, William I. Chamberlain, Robert J. Cuddihy, Cleveland E. Dodge, William T. Ellis, James Cardinal Gibbons, David H. Greer, Harold A. Hatch, William I. Haven, Myron T. Herriek, Hamilton Holt, Frank W. Jackson, Arthur Curtiss James, Frederick Lynch, Vance C. McCormick, Charles S. Macfarland, Henry B. F. Macfarland, William B. Millar, John R. Mott, Frank Mason North, George A. Plimpton, Philip Rhineland, William Jay Schieffelin, George T. Scott, Albert Shaw, William Sloane, Edward Lincoln Smith, Robert Eliot Speer, James M. Speers, Oscar S. Straus, Charles V. Vickrey, Harry A. Wheeler, Stanley White, Ray Lyman Wilbur, Talcott Williams, and Stephen S. Wise, who shall constitute the first board of trustees and constitute the members of the corporation. Vacancies occurring by death, resignation, or otherwise shall be filled by the remaining trustees in such manner as the by-laws shall prescribe, and the persons so elected shall thereupon become trustees and also members of the corporation.

Sec. 4. That the principal office of the corporation shall be located in the District of Columbia, but offices may be maintained and meetings

of the corporation or of the trustees and committees may be held in other places, such as the by-laws may from time to time fix.

SEC. 5. That the said trustees shall be entitled to take, hold, and administer any securities, funds, or property which may be transferred to them for the purposes and objects hereinbefore enumerated by the existing and unincorporated American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief, and such other funds or property as may at any time be given, devised, or bequeathed to them or to such corporation, for the purposes of the trust; with full power from time to time to adopt a common seal, to appoint officers, whether members of the board of trustees or otherwise, and such employees as may be deemed necessary for carrying on the business of the corporation, and at such salaries or with such remuneration as they may think proper; and full power to adopt by-laws and such rules or regulations as may be necessary to secure the safe and convenient transaction of the business of the corporation.

SEC. 6. That as soon as may be possible after the passage of this act a meeting of the trustees hereinbefore named shall be called by Cleveland H. Dodge, Henry Morgenthau, Abram I. Elkus, Edwin M. Bulkley, Alexander J. Hemphill, William B. Millar, George T. Scott, James L. Barton, and Charles V. Vickrey, or any six of them, at the borough of Manhattan, in the city of New York, by notice served in person or by mail, addressed to each trustee at his place of residence; and the said trustees named herein, or a majority thereof, being assembled, shall organize and proceed to adopt by-laws, to elect officers, and generally to organize the said corporation.

SEC. 7. That a meeting of the incorporators, their associates, or successors shall be held once in every year after the year of incorporation at such time and place as shall be prescribed in the by-laws, when the annual reports of the officers and executive boards shall be presented and members of the executive board elected for the ensuing year. Special meetings of the corporation may be called upon such notice as may be prescribed.

SEC. 8. That a copy of the constitution and by-laws and of all amendments thereto shall be filed with the Congress when adopted, and on or before the 1st day of April each year said corporation shall make and transmit to the Congress a report of its proceedings for the year ending December 31 preceding, including in such report the names and residences of its officers, and a full and itemized account of all receipts and expenditures.

SEC. 9. That the corporation shall have no power to issue certificates of stock or declare or pay any dividends, or otherwise distribute to its members any of its property, or the proceeds therefrom, or from its operations. On dissolution of the corporation otherwise than by act of Congress the property shall escheat to the United States.

SEC. 10. That all members and officers of the corporation and of its governing body may reside in or be citizens of any place within the United States.

SEC. 11. That the franchise herein granted shall terminate at the expiration of 25 years from the date of the approval of the act; and that Congress reserves the right to repeal, alter, or amend this act at any time.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a point of order. This is a very important bill, in my judgment, and there ought to be a quorum of the House present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order there is no quorum present, and obviously no quorum is present.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House again divided; and there were—ayes 59, noes none. So the call was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Freeman	Kennedy, Iowa	Purnell
Ashbrook	Ganly	Kennedy, R. I.	Ragsdale
Ayres	Godwin, N. C.	Kettner	Reavis
Babka	Goldfogle	King	Reed, N. Y.
Benson	Goodall	Lampert	Riddick
Britten	Goodykoontz	Layton	Riordan
Browne	Gould	Lee, Ga.	Rouse
Brumbaugh	Graham, Ill.	Leshner	Rowan
Burdick	Hamill	Lever	Rucker
Butler	Hamilton	McAndrews	Seully
Caldwell	Harrison	McArthur	Sims
Cantrill	Haskell	McClintic	Sisson
Dallinger	Hersman	McCulloch	Slomp
Dempsey	Hicks	McKiniry	Smith, N. Y.
Donovan	Hill	MacGregor	Steele
Dooling	Hudspeth	Major	Sullivan
Doremus	Hull, Iowa	Mason	Taylor, Ark.
Doughton	Hull, Tenn.	Merritt	Tilson
Dunn	Husted	Monahan, Wis.	Vare
Eagle	Hutchinson	Mooney	Webb
Echols	Ireland	Mott	Wilson, Ill.
Evans, Nev.	Jeffers	Neely	Wilson, Pa.
Fairfield	Johnson, Wash.	Nicholls, S. C.	
Focht	Jones, Pa.	Olney	
Frear	Kelley, Mich.	Paige	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty-five Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am going to consume 10 minutes—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has one hour.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I understand, but I am going to stop at the end of 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, Senate bill No. 180, which is before the House on its passage, is exactly identical with the bill H. R. 412. The bill H. R. 412 was reported favorably from the Committee on the Judiciary of this House recommending its passage without any amendment made to it in the committee. The reason for that I may explain to my colleagues is this: In the last House a bill exactly similar to this, I mean a bill for the same object as this, was presented and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. That committee, which, may I say, is opposed generally to a United States incorporation and never recommends them unless there are some special reasons to commend such a course—that committee pruned and amended the bill as it was introduced at great length, and then with those amendments the bill was reported back to the House, and my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD], was placed in charge of it, but it was not reached. Now, before this House the present bill, H. R. 412, was presented by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE], and it contains every one of the amendments which the Committee on the Judiciary said ought to be put in this bill. Therefore when it was before our committee for consideration at this time it had no need to be amended, for the new bill contains every one of the amendments which had been proposed by the Committee on the Judiciary to the last House. It was not reached in the last House, because of pressure of other business and the Judiciary Committee not having an opportunity to be heard. Now, what is this bill, gentlemen? A very simple proposition. It is a proposition to incorporate the gentlemen whose names have been read, who at present constitute the American Relief Committee that is dispensing charity in the Near East—in Armenia, in Syria, and in those portions of the East that were under the dominion of Turkey, and I wish to say to the House that it was satisfactorily shown to our committee that there was no other instrumentality working in that district. The Red Cross, as the report shows, was operating through this American Relief Committee, and distributed through that source probably \$2,000,000. I need not say to the House that the cry that comes up from that country is a most pathetic and distressing one. I need not say to the House that any man who is imbued with the slightest feeling of humanity ought to be interested in helping to promote and care for those people who in that territory have suffered the tortures of the damned. Millions of them have been destroyed, and millions more are living in absolute destitution.

This bill is asked to be passed solely and only for the purpose of putting this committee on a higher plane in administering this charity in those countries where the people know nothing of our divisions of States and districts, but look only to the idea of the United States of America, and with the imprimatur of Congress on them as a corporation it gives them a recognition that otherwise they would not possess. They do not dispense only the alms or the charity that is provided for in this country, but they get contributions from those who have already felt the tortures there. Out of the sympathy coming from their hearts for their fellow creatures around them these poor people out there contribute money to the American Relief Committee for the purpose of having it distributed properly among the needy, the destitute, and the suffering.

I can not imagine why there should be objection to the passage of this bill. As our committee said in its report:

The Committee on the Judiciary has been disposed to favor the granting of the incorporation for the purposes enumerated in the bill herein reported on for the reason that the Near East Relief has been doing a magnificent work among destitute peoples and are now actually upon the ground affording relief of the most direct and important kind, and, inasmuch as there are many matters to be taken up with the peoples they are seeking to help, it is apparent that the corporation extending relief having the dignity of approval by an act of Congress would be more easily and readily understood and given proper credit than if the incorporation had limited or State approval.

Recognizing the true principle to be that the granting and approval of articles of incorporation by Congress should be very infrequently granted, the committee is of opinion that this is one case where a great good may be accomplished thereby to suffering peoples.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. By request of the chairman of the committee, I was asked to take charge of this measure before the House, and I am simply performing my duty as a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does this bill take any money out of the United States Treasury at all?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. None at all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does it grant these people the franking privilege?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. It does not. And furthermore it provides that all the expenses of running this charity must be paid out of the pockets of the people who are incorporated, and not one penny of the money contributed to charity can be used for the payment of the expenses of the corporation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is there anything in this bill to give this corporation trading privileges?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. We thought there was in the first bill, and carefully excluded it, and there is nothing in this bill that would enable them to indulge in any sort of trading operations.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BEE. Is there anything in this bill that would authorize this corporation to use the congressional action as a means for "drives" and collections of money under this proposition?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Nothing except the fact that it has that dignity and status that would make its credit with these people both for receiving alms or charity which they might contribute and which they would be entitled to receive.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 10½ minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I will take another half minute to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. BEE. I would like to ask this question: Why, in section 11, do you provide that the life of the franchise shall terminate in 25 years? What will be the necessity, in other words, for the continuance of the charity to these unfortunate people beyond a year or so?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. The idea was to put in a limit, so that it should not be a perpetual charter, and that was all. And we made the limit large enough to cover. When the work stops, of course, this corporation will terminate and wind up its affairs. It must report every year to Congress, and it must pay over to Congress every dollar of money already appropriated which it has in its possession at the time.

Mr. BEE. I just wanted to ask one more question, and I will not pursue the inquiry further. Would this terminate by congressional action or by voluntary action on the part of the corporation?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I presume by voluntary action.

Mr. BEE. Any not by congressional action.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman suggest the section in the bill which places the restriction on the expenditure of the funds to the corporation to which the gentleman has referred?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I will not at this time, but—

Mr. CRAMTON. I will be glad to have you do it at any time.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. My time has expired.

Mr. WALSH. I would like my colleague on the committee to give his interpretation of the phrase "to promote the industrial welfare of those who have been rendered destitute." Does that mean engage in business over there?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Not at all. By enabling people to become self-supporting over there, which is perfectly legitimate, and not a corporation engaging in trade.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. For the purpose of information I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania the procedure of the winding up of the corporation incorporated under the laws of Congress under such congressional action as this corporation. Suppose at the expiration of 25 years it shall have half a million dollars in its treasury, to whom is the accounting made in winding up the corporation?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. To Congress. The money goes to the United States. That is in the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Yes; certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania to say that this incorporation or the gentlemen who were to be incorporated under this bill were not permitted to spend any part of the money received as contributions for the management of the affairs of the corporation. I do not see any such language as that in the bill. On the contrary, it does say, in section 5, that they are permitted, in carrying on the business of the incorporation, to pay such salaries or remunerations and employ such people as they may think proper. And I assume that is to be paid out of the contributions.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. That is the same question that another gentleman asked.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman has not answered it, however. The gentleman makes the statement, however, to the House—

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Listen and I will answer your questions. Wait until I have finished and then address me if you want to know something else. I did make that statement. Before our committee it was made perfectly clear that that was the course pursued by this American committee. Now, I will refer to the bill itself and be glad to make any further statement on this subject.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to know in what part of the bill the provision is made that the gentleman refers to.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not yield the floor. I am going to yield five minutes of time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], who is in opposition to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, can I have that time extended if it should be necessary?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. If I have the time, I shall be glad to.

Mr. CANNON. Let me say—and I hope it will not come out of the gentleman's time—after you consume the hour I think those who wish to discuss it further should have time. It seems to me this bill is of enough importance to receive two hours' consideration.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be on this bill two hours of general debate, including the time already consumed, one hour of which shall be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] and the other hour by any member of the Committee on the Judiciary who is opposed to the bill, if there be any; and, if not, by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that there shall be two hours of general debate, one hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] and the other by some member of the Committee on the Judiciary who is opposed to the bill or, if not, by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. The time for debate not being limited under the rule, if this unanimous consent is agreed to would the time for debate on this bill then be limited to two hours?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that would be a fair interpretation of it.

Mr. MANN. At the end of two hours it would be the same as if the previous question were ordered?

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not suggest that. The Chair thinks that ought to be included.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If that is to be coupled with the request, I shall object to the unanimous consent.

Mr. CRAMTON. The yielding of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], unless it were extended somewhat, would not appear to me to be a very liberal allotment of time.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I have one hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] has one hour, and after that, unless the previous question is moved, anyone obtaining the floor could address the House.

Mr. CANNON. There is to be one hour to a side, and then the previous question is to be ordered?

Mr. CRAMTON. I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania will move the previous question at the end of his hour.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that somebody might want to offer an amendment to this bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. I understand there is to be no such opportunity.

Mr. MANN. There is no such thing as general debate on this bill apart from any other debate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know; but if you order the previous question at the end of two hours, it shuts out the opportunity for amendment.

Mr. MANN. It would offer the opportunity for amendment during the two hours to anybody who got the floor by right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Suppose one gentleman gets the floor and holds it for an hour and then another gentleman gets the floor and holds it for another hour?

Mr. MANN. Then nobody would get it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If that is the case, I shall have to object.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Regular order!

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri object?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I extend the gentleman's time to 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania extends the time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] to 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. One further question: Does the gentleman propose to move the previous question at the end of the hour?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I shall feel justified in moving the previous question at the end of the hour, for the reason that the consideration of this bill has been met by every technical objection you gentlemen could devise.

Mr. CANNON. When you say "You gentlemen"—

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. When it has been sufficiently discussed, so that you gentlemen will know exactly what it is, I shall move the previous question.

Mr. CANNON. Then we will antagonize the previous question. I have read this bill to-day for the first time.

Mr. MANN. My colleague should have read it in the previous Congress. It has been pending here since the last Congress.

Mr. CANNON. It should be read in the Committee of the Whole. It makes a charge on the Public Treasury.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of no quorum.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves that the House do now adjourn. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks for the yeas and nays. Those who favor taking the vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Thirty-two gentlemen have risen—a sufficient number—and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. WALSH. I ask for the other side.

The SPEAKER. It is not necessary. There is a fifth of those present.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What right had the Member from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to make the motion unless the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] yielded the floor? The Chair had recognized the gentleman from Michigan, and he was then upon the floor.

Mr. WALSH. A point of no quorum was made.

The SPEAKER. Yes; a point of no quorum was made.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But that was not the motion to adjourn. I am asking about the motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that the motion to adjourn is not in order when the gentleman from Michigan was on the floor and recognized.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman was taken from the floor by the point of no quorum, and while that was pending the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] moved to adjourn.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I demanded the regular order, and thereupon the Speaker recognized the gentleman from Michigan.

The SPEAKER. And thereupon the point of no quorum was made. Those who favor the motion to adjourn will answer "aye" when their names are called; those opposed will answer "no." The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 98, nays 220, answered "present" 1, not voting 111, as follows:

YEAS—98.

Bacharach	Buchanan	Dale	Garrett
Baer	Burdick	Davis, Minn.	Glynn
Barbour	Campbell, Kans.	Dickinson, Iowa	Graham, Ill.
Begg	Cannon	Drane	Greene, Mass.
Blackman	Carew	Eagle	Greene, Vt.
Bowers	Crisp	Fordney	Hardy, Colo.
Brisson	Curry, Calif.	Freeman	Hastings

Haugen	Lampert	Parker	Strong, Kans.
Hersey	Langley	Radcliffe	Thompson, Ohio
Hickey	Layton	Raker	Tillman
Hoch	Lehibach	Ramseyer	Tincher
Howard	Little	Rayburn	Tinkham
Huddleston	McDuffie	Reber	Vinson
Hudspeth	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Rhodes	Walsh
James	Madden	Rodenberg	Walters
Jeffers	Major	Sears	Wheeler
Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Ohio	Sims	Williams
Jones, Tex.	Moore, Pa.	Sinclair	Wilson, Ill.
Kearns	Mudd	Small	Wilson, La.
Kendall	Murphy	Smith, Ill.	Wingo
Kiess	Newton, Mo.	Snell	Wood, Ind.
Kincheloe	Nicholls, S. C.	Steagall	Yates
Klecza	O'Connor	Stephens, Miss.	Young, N. Dak.
Kraus	Ogden	Stevens, Ohio	
LaGuardia	Overstreet	Stevenson	

NAYS—220

Ackerman	Dupré	Lanham	Ramsey
Alexander	Dyer	Lankford	Randall, Wis.
Almon	Eagan	Larsen	Reed, W. Va.
Anderson	Edmonds	Lea, Calif.	Ricketts
Andrews, Md.	Elliott	Loneragan	Robinson, N. C.
Andrews, Nebr.	Ellsworth	Longworth	Robsion, Ky.
Anthony	Elston	Luce	Rogers
Aswell	Emerson	Lutkin	Romjue
Ayres	Esch	Luhrling	Rose
Babka	Evans, Mont.	McAndrews	Rowe
Bankhead	Evans, Nebr.	McFadden	Rube
Bea	Evans, Nev.	McGinnon	Rucker
Bell	Fess	McKeown	Sanders, Ind.
Black	Fields	McLane	Sanders, La.
Bland, Mo.	Fisher	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanders, Va.
Bland, Va.	Fitzgerald	McPherson	Schall
Blanton	Flood	MacCrate	Sells
Boles	Poster	Magee	Sherwood
Booher	French	Maher	Shreve
Box	Fuller, Ill.	Mann	Siegel
Brand	Gallagher	Mansfield	Sinnot
Briggs	Gallivan	Mapes	Smith, Idaho
Brooks, Pa.	Gandy	Martin	Smithwick
Browning	Gard	Mead	Steenerson
Burke	Garland	Michener	Stines
Burroughs	Garner	Miller	Strong, Pa.
Byrnes, S. C.	Goldfogle	Minahan, N. J.	Summers, Wash.
Bryns, Tenn.	Good	Mondell	Summers, Tex.
Campbell, Pa.	Goodwin, Ark.	Montague	Sweet
Candler	Graham, Pa.	Moon	Temple
Caraway	Green, Iowa	Mooney	Thompson, Okla.
Carss	Griest	Moore, Va.	Towner
Carter	Griffin	Moore, Ind.	Treadway
Casey	Hadley	Morgan	Upshaw
Chindblom	Hardy, Tex.	Morin	Vaile
Christopherson	Hawley	Nelson, Mo.	Venable
Clark, Mo.	Hayden	Nelson, Wis.	Vestal
Classon	Hays	Newton, Minn.	Volstead
Cleary	Heflin	O'Connell	Wason
Coady	Hernandez	Oldfield	Watkins
Cole	Hersman	Oliver	Watson, Pa.
Collier	Hill	Osborne	Watson, Va.
Connally	Houghton	Padgett	Weaver
Costello	Hulings	Park	Webster
Cramton	Husted	Parrish	Welling
Cullen	Igoe	Pell	Welty
Currie, Mich.	Jacoway	Peters	White, Kans.
Dallinger	Johnson, Miss.	Phelan	White, Me.
Darrow	Johnson, N. Y.	Platt	Winslow
Davis, Tenn.	Juni	Porter	Wise
Dewalt	Kelly, Pa.	Pou	Woods, Va.
Dickinson, Mo.	Kennedy, R. I.	Quin	Wright
Domink	Kinkaid	Rainey, H. T.	Young, Tex.
Dowell	Knutson	Rainey, J. W.	Zihlman
Dunbar	Kreider		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Butler

NOT VOTING—111.

Ashbrook	Focht	Lazaro	Rouse
Barkley	Frear	Lee, Ga.	Rowan
Benham	Fuller, Mass.	Leshner	Sabath
Benson	Ganly	Lever	Sanders, N. Y.
Bland, Ind.	Godwin, N. C.	Linthicum	Sanford
Britten	Goodall	McArthur	Scott
Brooks, Ill.	Goodykoontz	McClintic	Scully
Brown	Gould	McClulloch	Sisson
Brunbaugh	Hamill	McKenzie	Slemp
Caldwell	Hamilton	McKinley	Smith, Mich.
Cantrill	Harrison	MacGregor	Smith, N. Y.
Clark, Fla.	Haskell	Mason	Snyder
Cooper	Hicks	Mays	Stedman
Copley	Holland	Merritt	Steele
Crago	Hull, Iowa	Monahan, Wis.	Sullivan
Crowther	Hull, Tenn.	Mott	Taylor, Ark.
Davey	Humphreys	Neely	Taylor, Colo.
Dempsey	Hutchinson	Nichols, Mich.	Taylor, Tenn.
Denison	Ireland	Olney	Thomas
Dent	Johnson, Ky.	Palge	Tilson
Donovan	Johnson, Wash.	Purnell	Timberlake
Dooling	Jones, Pa.	Ragsdale	Voigt
Dorems	Kahn	Randall, Calif.	Ward
Doughton	Kelley, Mich.	Reavis	Webb
Dunn	Kennedy, Iowa	Reed, N. Y.	Whaley
Echols	Kettner	Riddick	Wilson, Pa.
Fairfield	King	Riordan	Woodyard
Ferris	Kitchin		

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BUTLER with Mr. STEELE.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.
 Mr. COOPER with Mr. BARKLEY.
 Mr. DENISON with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
 Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. BENSON.
 Mr. GOULD with Mr. DAVEY.
 Mr. HASKELL with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
 Mr. JOHNSON of Washington with Mr. DOUGHTON.
 Mr. MCARTHUR with Mr. GANLEY.
 Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. HOLLAND.
 Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.
 Mr. PAIGE with Mr. DONOVAN.
 Mr. PLATT with Mr. RAGSDALE.
 Mr. REAVIS with Mr. MAYS.
 Mr. SANDERS of New York with Mr. RIORDAN.
 Mr. SCOTT with Mr. SABATH.
 Mr. SANFORD with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.
 Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. STEDMAN.
 Mr. TIMBERLAKE with Mr. THOMAS.
 Mr. VOIGT with Mr. WHALEY.
 Mr. WARD with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. LINTHICUM.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have used?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used 15 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] will proceed.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is at least ostensibly a bill to incorporate for Near East relief. As such I am sure the bill must be a popular one with Members of Congress, because it purports to be for charity and for charity a long way from home. Hence it will be peculiarly appealing to us. But, gentlemen, the question of charity might very quickly be dismissed from our minds, for the reason that in order to accomplish every charitable purpose that any of these gentlemen desire they could months ago when they started their campaign have secured an incorporation in practically any State in the Union. But the reason they do not choose to do that should be the reason why this Congress will refuse to give them the special Federal charter they seek. Special charters of incorporation have been frowned upon by States and the Federal Government for many years, because of their unpleasant experience of the danger from special acts of incorporation, the danger that very able men, knowing just what they want, frame a bill that may not have the real purpose upon its surface, but may have it concealed in some vague language that would not be noted by the lawmaking body.

I would not presume to venture an opinion as to the constitutionality of this act or venture to attack its constitutionality, coming from the Committee on the Judiciary and having been framed in behalf of an organization that has in its membership so many eminent corporation lawyers as does this bill. But I may at least suggest for your consideration that under the Constitution the Congress of the United States has the power to grant an act of incorporation only for the purposes specified; that is, it is only to assist in carrying into effect powers expressly granted by the Constitution to Congress that there has been inferred the authority to grant a charter of incorporation.

The one most common is a corporation to engage in interstate commerce, which is inferred from the interstate-commerce clause, but it has been expressly stated that the purpose of this corporation is not for industrial purposes or to engage in commerce. This corporation act if sustained at all must be sustained in connection with the power of Congress to govern the District of Columbia. All this bill has to do with the District of Columbia is in section 4, where it provides that the principal office of this corporation shall be in the District. It does not provide that the only office shall be in the District, it does not provide that any single officer or employee shall live in the District, it does not provide that any officer shall actually be in the principal office, it does not provide that the meetings shall be in the District. It is only a subterfuge.

That eminent gentleman, Mr. Roland Carlisle Heisler, connected with the University of Pennsylvania, says in his work on Federal Incorporation, pages 25 and 26:

But if Congress should abuse this power . . . the remedy would lie in the hands of the Supreme Court. That tribunal will not question the motives of Congress when an act is a clear exercise of an express power, but the purpose or end of the legislation in question will be investigated to determine if it is actually within the express power. The mere fact that Congress declares that the end is within an express power will not prevent the court from questioning this, and if the real purpose is to reach subjects which are beyond the power of Congress the act will be declared unconstitutional.

But, anyway, if it may be sustained as within the letter of the Constitution, it is not within the spirit. There is no reason for incorporating this organization in the District of Columbia, no good reason that should appeal to Congress.

Now, in the very brief time that I have, and I am sorry that debate is to be so brief, let me call to your attention some of the provisions of this special charter; and I am willing to confess to the House that I am not a constitutional expert nor am I a corporation lawyer. I can not claim to point out all the real weaknesses inside the bill drawn for a corporation to be made up of gentlemen like Elihu Root and Charles Evans Hughes and other distinguished lawyers.

It is said to be in order to let certain philanthropic gentlemen in this country organize for the benefit of charity to be administered in the Near East—that is, an east that is very far from here. Section 2 states:

The object for which said incorporation is incorporated shall be to provide relief and to assist in the repatriation, rehabilitation, and reestablishment of suffering—

And so forth.

And then, after that, comes language which has no connection whatever with the Near East, but is as broad as language can make it—these gentleman can administer charity the world over.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will yield to the gentleman, for the gentleman can give me additional time.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Does not section 2 say the suffering dependents in the Near East?

Mr. CRAMTON. I did not read all that, but I will admit that the first part relates to the Near East, but the other part has no connection whatever with the Near East.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Referring to section 2, does it not provide the object—

Mr. CRAMTON. It consists in the repatriation, the rehabilitation, and reestablishment of suffering—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And repatriation means—

Mr. CRAMTON. The taking of the Armenians back to Armenia.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is indulging in repatriation in foreign countries.

Mr. CRAMTON. Note how broad this language is. It has no connection with the first part of the paragraph. It says:

To provide for the care of orphans and widows and to promote the social, economic, and industrial welfare of those who have been rendered destitute, or dependent, directly or indirectly, by the vicissitudes of war, the cruelties of men, or other causes beyond their control.

There is no limitation to the Near East. Every man or woman or child who has been rendered helpless from "causes beyond their control" is within the ken of the charity of Mr. Root and Mr. Hughes and these other distinguished philanthropists. Furthermore, we form this organization of distinguished gentlemen, and it becomes perpetual, self-continuing. Vacancies are filled by appointment by the trustees. We may be interested in charity in the Near East, we may be interested in charity the world over, as section 2 provides—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to yield me five minutes more.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. We should be interested in determining whether some gentlemen are securing here a charter that even if they execute properly in years to come may grow to be a gigantic corporation, with millions of wealth in its hands, which might be used for sinister purposes in this country. We have refused this privilege to Carnegie and to Rockefeller, and why should we give it to any men in such broad and unguarded language? Let me call your attention further to the provisions of the bill. Let us take the matter of the annual report, which, apparently, might not be important. Section 8 authorizes them to file their report with Congress, and I am advised by the best authorities about this House that this carries with it the privilege of having the report printed by the Government, and then it goes under the franking privilege. Section 10 provides—

That all members and officers of the corporation and of its governing body may reside in or be citizens of any place within the United States.

They do not have to be residents of the United States. These gentlemen do not have to be citizens of the United States. These gentlemen may, any or all, in the time to come in the future be citizens of any foreign country, but the Congress of the United States will have given to them a Federal charter under which they may engage upon such visionary schemes as section 2 provides for.

I appeal to this House not to be carried away by their natural feelings of sympathy for charity, their natural desire to promote it; but, instead, they should look at this as a hard business propo-

sition, realizing that these men can get a charter anywhere, but that for some reason known to themselves they desire to come to Congress and get a special act.

It will be noticed that there is no Armenian on this list of directors. And could it be possible that some organization might be formed of distinguished men, philanthropists though they may be, but who are also incidentally corporation lawyers and great corporation leaders, captains of industry, seeking commercial advantages in the Far East or in the Near East, and giving out in connection with the Federal incorporation an idea to the people of that section of the world that they represent in some way the Government of the United States, who in the bestowal of their relief might acquire for themselves a standing and a prestige that would result in some way to their own pecuniary advantage or the advantage of their corporation, the securing of concessions? I thank the gentleman for his extension of time, and yield back the remainder of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE].

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] has asked this House not to be carried away by appeals to sympathy and charity. I retort by asking that the gentlemen of the House be not carried away by appeals inciting prejudice to the individual incorporators of this institution. I think it is obvious that some of the opposition to this bill, and I am not attributing it to the gentleman from Michigan, is based upon unconscious dislike of some of the incorporators of this charter. I submit to the House that this is a very narrow view and one in no way pertinent in determining our vote.

The gentleman says that this is a perpetual charter. On the face of the bill it is limited to 25 years. And in the character of the enterprise it can hardly last more than a few years, for the charity, by the very nature of its undertaking, must end in a brief period. The gentleman says it is not charitable, because no charter has been heretofore applied for from any of the States. I submit that this is a non sequitur. The reason for this charter is very simple. Conditions and not theories, to use an old expression, now confront us. We are dealing with a temperament of the peoples of that eastern country, and not only temperaments, but their lack of knowledge of the affairs of this country. To go before these people in administering this great charity with a charter from New York, Pennsylvania, or Ohio would convey little significance or impression, but if it has the sanction of the Congress of the United States such a charter at once facilitates their negotiations, both in governmental and business relations. If its agents go to a bank or to a government official in relation to this charity, and do not have a national charter, they would have to have in all probability additional and elaborate credentials, and with the eastern mind full of doubts and misgivings, in the absence of such supporting documents, the whole business negotiations might be delayed or nullified.

Therefore the charter is simply to better administer this charity. And it is charity, gentlemen. I make no disguise about it. It would never have enlisted my support for an instant if it were not a charity, a clean charity in origin and purpose and object. [Applause.]

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will.

Mr. BEGG. On page 2, line 18, would the gentleman be willing to incorporate the word "charity," following the word "provide," and cut out, beginning after the word "widows," all down to the word "welfare"?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I personally would be willing to accept any amendment that would confine it beyond question to charity.

Mr. BEGG. Then, do I understand we will have an opportunity to introduce amendments?

Mr. MONTAGUE. But the status of this bill is such that if you delay the bill now and do not take the Senate bill you need not act at all. Time is now a vital thing.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield for one further question? Will that delay it by introducing amendments?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think so, because the bill would have to go back to the Senate, and unless this bill can be passed within the next 24 hours I understand it is of no need.

Mr. BEGG. Is the gentleman asking this Congress to swallow it whole, without any opportunity of debate or discussion or of safeguarding it in any way? Does the gentleman think that is the thing to do?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not asking Congress to do any such thing, and the gentleman ought to be quite well aware that I am not doing it.

Mr. BEGG. Well—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Let me answer the gentleman. I am asking the Congress to take a bill that has been reported by two

committees of this House at the last session, namely, the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BEGG. But there is no opportunity—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Wait a minute. The same bill is again reported by the Committee on the Judiciary of this House, and this same bill has been reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and passed unanimously by the Senate. Am I trying to ram a bill down anybody's throat that comes to this House with such an imprimatur and such considered action? [Applause.]

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman permit one more question?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman appreciates there are about 60 of us here who never heard that debate and have had no opportunity of hearing anything of this debate, only by the advocates of this bill.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I appreciate that.

Mr. BEGG. We appreciate it, too.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And I am very sorry to see gentlemen in that attitude; but if the circumstances are such as to limit their knowledge upon this question, it is no reason that this charity should be withheld from millions of starving and suffering people. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would like to ask the gentleman the reason why this bill, which has been pending now for a year or two, must pass within 24 hours or be of no use?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Because the gentlemen are to sail.

Mr. CRAMTON. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I did not understand him.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I say the gentlemen who are to take this charter abroad are to sail in the next day or two, and they wish to carry the charter.

Mr. CRAMTON. Sail on an act of Congress?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Oh, no; but they wish to have the Congress facilitate them, otherwise they will be deprived of a great advantage.

Mr. CRAMTON. Could they not have gotten a State charter six months ago in many of the States?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am opposed, as a general proposition, to national incorporations. There is not a man in this House who is more opposed than I am to cluttering up the proceedings of this Congress with national incorporations, but I am not so narrow that I can not see exceptions to the general rule. I submit that in the history of this world there never has been among the same number of people so much misery, so much suffering, so much sorrow, and so much starvation as there has been in Syria, Armenia, and contiguous territory. Why, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] spoke of repatriation as if that should exclude consideration of this bill. What is meant by repatriation? Simply to bring these widows and children back to their own homes from the contiguous and other territory into which they have been so ruthlessly driven. Repatriation is not sinister; it is holy.

Mr. BLACKMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BLACKMON. Does not my friend think that charity should begin at home, and that before granting these Federal corporations in a foreign sense we should look after the immense suffering in this country?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will say to the gentleman that I do believe in charity beginning at home, but if the gentleman's argument is right he would blot out every foreign missionary society in the world. Two lights will not put out each other. The more light for these suffering people the more for home and for mankind. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will.

Mr. FOSTER. I am one of these freshmen. I would like to know why this charity can not be exercised under the American Red Cross, that I thought had an international reputation?

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is no advocate of this incorporation more sympathetic than the American Red Cross.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not answer my question. Why should we incorporate this rather than to put it through the Red Cross?

Mr. MONTAGUE. It now has more than it can do, and it favors this incorporation.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I will answer the gentleman from Ohio. The reason is this: That the Red Cross has no agencies through that territory, and the Red Cross has given its money to this agency to distribute in that area.

Mr. FOSTER. This is the only case that did not come to the Red Cross, as I happen to know as an official of it, in the last two years.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. You are not well informed. Mr. FOSTER. I think I am better informed on that proposition than the gentleman thinks I am.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Let me answer this question before you make it.

Mr. DEWALT. Let me repeat—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] makes the point that no quorum is present. It is clear that no quorum is present.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I move a call of the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, had the Speaker announced that there was no quorum present?

The SPEAKER. The Speaker had so announced. The vote is on the call of the House.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MADDEN. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 69, noes 26.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. A call of the House is ordered. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Evans, Mont.	Langley	Rouse
Ashbrook	Fairfield	Lazaro	Rowan
Baer	Ferris	Lee, Ga.	Rowe
Barkley	Focht	Leshner	Rucker
Benson	Fuller, Mass.	Lever	Sabath
Bland, Ind.	Ganly	Linthicum	Sanders, N. Y.
Booher	Godwin, N. C.	Lubring	Sanford
Britten	Goodall	McArthur	Scully
Browne	Goodykoontz	McClintic	Sells
Brumbaugh	Gould	McCulloch	Sims
Burdick	Hamill	McKinley	Sisson
Burroughs	Hamilton	Mason	Slomp
Byrnes, S. C.	Harrison	Merritt	Small
Caldwell	Haskell	Monahan, Wis.	Smith, N. Y.
Cantrill	Hernandez	Neely	Snyder
Clark, Fla.	Hicks	Nicholls, S. C.	Steele
Classon	Holland	Nolan	Stephens, Miss.
Copley	Hull, Iowa	O'Connor	Sullivan
Costello	Hull, Tenn.	Oldfield	Taylor, Ark.
Davis, Minn.	Hutchinson	Olney	Taylor, Colo.
Dempsey	Ireland	Padgett	Thompson, Okla.
Denison	Johnson, Ky.	Paige	Tilson
Dent	Johnson, Miss.	Parker	Ward
Dickinson, Mo.	Johnson, Wash.	Purnell	Webb
Donovan	Jones, Pa.	Rainey, H. T.	Whaley
Dooling	Jones, Tex.	Randall, Calif.	White, Me.
Doremus	Kelley, Mich.	Reavis	Wilson, Pa.
Doughton	Kelly, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.	Woodward
Dyer	Kendall	Riddick	Wright
Echols	Kennedy, Iowa	Riordan	
Edmonds	Kettner	Rodenberg	
Ellsworth	King		

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and two gentlemen have answered to their names.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota moves that the House do now adjourn. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 105, noes 88.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks for the yeas and nays. Those in favor of taking the vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Forty-six gentlemen—a sufficient number—have risen.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the motion to adjourn will, when their names are called, answer "aye"; those opposed will answer "no." The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 147, nays 138, answered "present" 1, not voting 144, as follows:

YEAS—147.

Anderson	Bacharach	Barkley	Blackmon
Aswell	Baer	Begg	Bowers
Babka	Barbour	Beil	Brinson

Brooks, Ill.	Glynn	McKenzie	Shreve
Buchanan	Graham, Ill.	McKeown	Sinclair
Byrnes, S. C.	Greene, Mass.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Ill.
Byrnes, Tenn.	Greene, Vt.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Smithwick
Campbell, Kans.	Hardy, Colo.	Major	Snell
Cannon	Hastings	Martin	Steagall
Caraway	Hawley	Mays	Stedman
Carew	Hays	Mead	Strong, Kans.
Carter	Hernandez	Michener	Summers, Tex.
Chindblom	Hersey	Moon	Sweet
Christopherson	Hoch	Mooney	Taylor, Colo.
Clark, Mo.	Houghton	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Tenn.
Cleary	Howard	Moore, Pa.	Thomas
Cole	Huddleston	Mudd	Tillman
Crago	James	Murphy	Tincher
Cramton	Jeffers	Nelson, Mo.	Treadway
Crisp	Johnson, S. Dak.	Newton, Mo.	Venable
Currie, Mich.	Juul	Nicholls, S. C.	Voigt
Curry, Calif.	Kearns	Ogden	Walsh
Dale	Kendall	Overstreet	Walters
Davis, Tenn.	Kincheloe	Porter	Wason
Denison	Klecza	Quin	Watkins
Dickinson, Iowa	Kraus	Radcliffe	Welling
Dominick	LaGuardia	Raker	Welty
Dowell	Lampert	Rayburn	Wheeler
Dunbar	Langley	Reber	White, Kans.
Elliott	Larsen	Rhodes	Williams
Evans, Nebr.	Layton	Ricketts	Willson, La.
Foster	Lea, Calif.	Robison, Ky.	Wilson, Pa.
Freeman	Lehlbach	Rodenberg	Wingo
Fuller, Ill.	Little	Sanders, Ind.	Wood, Ind.
Gandy	Loneragan	Sanders, N. Y.	Young, N. Dak.
Garner	McAndrews	Sears	Young, Tex.
Garrett	McDuffie	Sherwood	

NAYS—138.

Ackerman	Elston	Knutson	Rainey, J. W.
Alexander	Emerson	Kreider	Ramsey
Almon	Fess	Lanham	Randall, Wis.
Andrews, Md.	Fields	Lankford	Reed, W. Va.
Andrews, Nebr.	Fisher	Luce	Robinson, N. C.
Ayres	Fitzgerald	McGlennon	Rogers
Bankhead	Flood	McLane	Romjue
Bee	Fordney	McPherson	Rose
Benham	French	MacCrate	Ruby
Black	Gallivan	MacGregor	Sanders, La.
Bland, Mo.	Gard	Maher	Saunders, Va.
Bland, Va.	Goldfogle	Mann	Scott
Boles	Good	Mansfield	Siegel
Box	Goodwin, Ark.	Mapes	Smith, Mich.
Brand	Gould	Miller	Steenerson
Briggs	Graham, Pa.	Minahan, N. J.	Stevenson
Browning	Green, Iowa	Mondell	Stiness
Burke	Griffin	Montague	Strong, Pa.
Campbell, Pa.	Hadley	Moore, Va.	Temple
Casey	Hardy, Tex.	Moore, Ind.	Timberlake
Classon	Hayden	Morgan	Tinkham
Coady	Hersman	Morin	Towner
Collier	Hickey	Nelson, Wis.	Upshaw
Connally	Hill	Nichols, Mich.	Valle
Cooper	Hudspeth	O'Connell	Vestal
Crowther	Hulings	Osborne	Volstead
Cullen	Humphreys	Park	Watson, Pa.
Dallinger	Husted	Parrish	Watson, Va.
Darrow	Igoe	Pell	Weaver
Davey	Jacoway	Peters	Webster
Dewalt	Johnston, N. Y.	Phelan	Winslow
Drane	Kahn	Platt	Woods, Va.
Dunn	Kiess	Ragsdale	Wright
Dupré	Kinkaid		
Eagan	Kitchin		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Schall

NOT VOTING—144.

Anthony	Fairfield	Lee, Ga.	Rouse
Ashbrook	Ferris	Leshner	Rowan
Benson	Focht	Lever	Rowe
Bland, Ind.	Frear	Linthicum	Rucker
Blanton	Fuller, Mass.	Longworth	Sabath
Booher	Gallagher	Lufkin	Sanford
Britten	Ganly	Lubring	Scully
Brooks, Pa.	Garland	McArthur	Sells
Browne	Godwin, N. C.	McClintic	Sims
Brumbaugh	Goodall	McCulloch	Sinnot
Burdick	Goodykoontz	McFadden	Sisson
Burroughs	Griest	McKinley	Slomp
Butler	Hamill	Madden	Small
Caldwell	Hamilton	Mason	Smith, Idaho
Candler	Harrison	Merritt	Smith, N. Y.
Cantrill	Haskell	Monahan, Wis.	Snyder
Carrs	Haugen	Mott	Steele
Clark, Fla.	Heflin	Neely	Stephens, Miss.
Copley	Hicks	Newton, Minn.	Stephens, Ohio
Costello	Holland	Nolan	Sullivan
Davis, Minn.	Hull, Iowa	O'Connor	Summers, Wash.
Dempsey	Hull, Tenn.	Oldfield	Taylor, Ark.
Dent	Hutchinson	Olney	Thompson, Ohio
Dickinson, Mo.	Ireland	Padgett	Thompson, Okla.
Donovan	Johnson, Ky.	Paige	Tilson
Dooling	Johnson, Miss.	Parker	Vare
Doremus	Johnson, Wash.	Pou	Vinson
Doughton	Jones, Pa.	Purnell	Ward
Dyer	Jones, Tex.	Rainey, H. T.	Webb
Eagle	Kelley, Mich.	Ramseyer	Whaley
Echols	Kelly, Pa.	Randall, Calif.	White, Me.
Edmonds	Kennedy, Iowa	Reavis	Wilson, Ill.
Ellsworth	Kennedy, R. I.	Ridick	Wise
Esch	Kettner	Riordan	Woodward
Evans, Mont.	King		Yates
Evans, Nev.	Lazaro		Zihlman

So the motion to adjourn was agreed to.

Before the announcement of the vote,

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the unsettled condition of affairs in the city, and the anxiety of some Members to be at home with their families, I change my vote from "nay" to "yea."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must not debate it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recorded "present."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. BLANTON. I was not in the Hall, but I should like to be recorded "present" under the precedent in the last Congress.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no authority to do that.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not make a parliamentary inquiry during a roll call.

Mr. BLANTON. May I make a point of order?

The SPEAKER. No; not during a roll call.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 23, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6750) to deport certain undesirable aliens and to deny readmission to those deported, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 143), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 7703) to amend section 4438 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 7704) to control by license the possession and sale of firearms and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7705) to amend section 239 of the tariff act of October 3, 1913, in respect to the tariff on buttons of shell and pearl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 7706) to extend the time for the construction of the Broadway Street Bridge across the Arkansas River between the cities of Little Rock and Argenta, Ark.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7707) to extend the time for the construction of the Main Street Bridge across the Arkansas River between the cities of Little Rock and Argenta, Ark.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 7708) providing for the purchase or condemnation of a site for a target range at or near Great Piece Meadows, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIGSBY: A bill (H. R. 7709) to authorize the incorporated town of Petersburg, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$75,000 for the purpose of constructing and installing a municipal electric light and power plant and for the construction of a public-school building; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 7710) to provide homes for soldiers, sailors, and marines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 188) for appointment of a special committee to investigate reign of crime in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Resolution (H. Res. 189) to request the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department to investigate certain claims in connection with the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma filed since July 1, 1918; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: Resolution (H. Res. 190) directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House of Representatives certain information; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: Resolution (H. Res. 191) requesting information from the Director General of Railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 155) to authorize the President to use the military forces to preserve order in Washington; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 156) providing for a survey for a ship canal across the State of Florida, connecting the Atlantic Ocean with the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. VAILE: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) requesting the President to declare a state of martial law in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 7711) granting a pension to Christie Jones and Goldfish Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BENSON: A bill (H. R. 7712) granting a pension to Henrietta W. Carlisle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 7713) granting a pension to Arabella G. Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 7714) for the relief of Logan Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EAGLE: A bill (H. R. 7715) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Lang; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7716) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Slack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 7717) granting an increase of pension to John Weed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 7718) for the relief of Ella Lillard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 7719) granting an increase of pension to James C. Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7720) granting a pension to Mary Boner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7721) granting an increase of pension to John C. Rhinehart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7722) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Skelton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7723) granting a pension to Rowena Fisher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 7724) granting an increase of pension to Peter Shoemaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7725) granting a pension to Matilda Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 7726) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 7727) for the relief of H. P. Warfield; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 7728) granting a pension to Charles W. Streeter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 7729) for the relief of Charles D. Shay; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7730) granting a pension to William Constable; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7731) granting a pension to Martin K. Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 7732) granting a pension to Joseph R. Owens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 7733) for the relief of Jabez Lumbert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 7734) granting a pension to Diantha Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 7735) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Calkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 7736) granting a pension to Elizabeth Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. DEWALT: Petition of sundry citizens of Reading and Berks County, Pa., urging the Government to retain operation and ownership of railroads and public utilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of board of supervisors of Alameda County, Calif., favoring the establishment of a United States naval academy on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of William Hoesfoll Post, No. 90, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring bill to increase pensions of all Civil War soldiers to \$50 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Petition of Polish Alma Mater, Chicago, Ill., and the Polish Publishing Co., Chicago, Ill., opposing Senate bill 2099; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of Arthur C. Davis and many other former soldiers, of Mobile, Ala., for an increase in bonus to soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KREIDER: Petition of citizens of Carlisle, Pa., to repeal the tax on sodas, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Fox's Meat Market, George R. Plater & Co., and the American Credit & Collection Co., of Baltimore, and E. G. Wheeler & Son, of Glyndon, all in the State of Maryland, opposing the passage of Senate bill 2202, known as the Kenyon bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of James F. McDonald, C. Augustus Bauer, Benjamin F. Sillers, Harry D. Delcher, Walter M. Gees, all of the Journeymen Bookbinders' Union, Washington, D. C., and Arthur Scofield, William W. Wallace, Sylvester F. Carman, John B. Ranch, Montford L. Ellis, Harry B. Rohrbaugh, Frank B. Helm, William H. Hagner, all of the Printing Pressmen's Union, Washington, D. C., urging support of House bill 5418; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of one citizen of Maryland, urging support of Mason resolution providing for appropriation for a diplomatic representative to Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of A. J. Pattie, Baltimore, Md., protesting against wording of prohibition bills regarding flavoring extracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Common Council of the city of Bridgeport, Conn., for the recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, protesting against tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of New York Commandery of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, asking that the flagship *Hartford* be associated always with the achievements of the Nation's great admiral, Farragut; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 2202; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany House bill 7686, claim of Eli Pettijohn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Petition of Ed. H. Beeswick and 99 other other residents of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the repeal of the war tax on candy, ice cream, and soda fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of B. T. Bush, of New York, against the Kenyon bill (S. 2202); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the International Federation of Draftsmen's Union, San Francisco, Calif., indorsing a suitable civil-service retirement law; also a statement of principles as advanced by the National Council of American Patriots, Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of American Federation of Labor in opposition to mob rule and lynching; National Federation of Federal Employees protesting against Representative Good's amendment to the Nolan minimum-wage bill for Government employees; Milk Producers' Association, Modesto, Calif., and California Associated Raisin Co., indorsing Senator Capper's amendment to the antitrust law; and the Visalia Commercial Club, Visalia, Calif., requesting the rescinding of the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of B. T. Bush, of New York, opposing the Kenyon bill (S. 2202); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of Rochester Branch, No. 210, National Association of Letter Carriers, and Local 215, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, asking immediate increase in salary effective July 1, 1919, of at least 50 per cent over and above present temporary wage scale, to continue in effect until report of the committee on the readjustment of salaries of post-office employees is received; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, July 23, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before Thee as representatives of this great Nation pledged to justice and peace. We deplore the expression of bitterness and hate that has disgraced the streets of our National Capital in the last few days. We thank Thee that this is the exhibition of but the smallest fraction of the great multitude of Thy people in this country of ours, who love justice and right. We pray that Thou wilt strengthen the arm of the law, that Thou wilt give the hand of justice to those who deal with lawbreakers, that Thou wilt guide and protect those who defend the rights and liberties of the people. Do Thou bring out of these expressions that arise a deeper sense of our dependence upon God and of our league with Thee for the establishment of peace in all the earth. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

FOREST FIRES IN IDAHO.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, which will be read.

The communication was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, July 22, 1919.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Forest fires of unusual intensity and extent prevail in Idaho. Some of these are on the unreserved public lands, while some are on forest reserves and some on private lands. I have authorized Mr. Tallman, the Commissioner of Public Lands, to draw upon the moneys appropriated for the field service in the Land Office for funds with which to fight these fires. This is a matter of the gravest emergency, and already we have specifically allotted \$40,000 for this work; but this will be quite insufficient. It seems to me a matter of such vital importance that I take the liberty of suggesting that a joint resolution should be passed through both Houses authorizing an expenditure up to the amount of \$500,000, which should contain an authorization for the reimbursement of the field-service fund, which was not intended by Congress for any such purpose except perhaps in some very minor amount. The latest word from our agents in Idaho is that all that can be done is to keep the fires from spreading over a much wider territory and that they can not be extinguished save by a heavy rain, of which there is no immediate prospect.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

ISSUANCE OF RAILROAD PASSES (S. DOC. NO. 57).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Director General of Railroads, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 8th instant, information relative to the issuance of annual all-line railroad sleeping-car, parlor-car, and dining-car passes issued during the period of Federal control, which will be printed and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. NEWBERRY. The communication just laid before the Senate by the Chair is in response to a resolution offered by myself, and I ask that it be printed in the Record.

The communication is as follows:

UNITED STATES RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, July 22, 1919.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: With regard to the resolution adopted by the Senate on July 8, calling upon the Director General of Railroads to report certain facts in connection with annual all-line railroad sleeping-car, parlor-car, and dining-car passes issued during the period of Federal control, preparation of facts desired was begun immediately upon receipt of the resolution. In view of the detailed nature of the information requested, the facts can not be presented immediately, but pending a complete report, I thought I should submit to the Senate the facts along general lines.

No passes are issued for free dining-car service. In issuing passes good on railroads under Federal operation and good for sleeping-car and parlor-car accommodations, the Railroad Administration has been guided by the established practices which had been adopted under private control in conformity with the provisions adopted by Congress in the interstate commerce act and in amendments thereto, governing the matter of free passes.

Under private control, it was the general practice for the principal railroad officers to have annual passes on their own railroads and in addition to obtain exchange passes from practically all other railroads in the country, so far as they might be applied for. The result was that each of these general railroad officers had a large number of annual passes covering most of the important mileage in the country. In addition the chief managing officers very frequently had annual Pullman passes good on all Pullman lines in the United States. The officers who had annual passes for themselves on the railroads generally also had annual railroad and Pullman passes for the dependent members of their families, or could and did obtain trip passes as a matter of course upon request.